DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 548 SP 015 764

TITLE	Educational Programs That Work. Secondary Basic Skills.
INSTITUTION	Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	80
CONTRACT	300-77-0415
NOTE	51p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Basic Skills; Instructional Improvement; *Mathematics; *Reading; *Secondary Education; Skill Development; Validated Programs; *Writing
IDENTIFIERS	*National Diffusion Network

ABSTRACT

Outlined in this National Diffusion Network catalog are exemplary basic skills programs in mathematics, reading, and writing, for secondary-level students, grades 7-12. Program descriptions contain information on the target audience, description of program format, evidence of effectiveness, implementation requirements, financial requirements, and services and materials available. The availability of additional information on the listed programs is discussed in the introduction to the catalog. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183548

SP

SECONDARY BASIC SKILLS • SECONDARY BASIC SKILLS • SECONDARY BAS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kenneth W. Harms

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Educational Programs That Work

Secondary Basic Skills

WINTER 1980

NDN

NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

SP015764

Educational Programs That Work

•

Secondary Basic Skills

A RESOURCE OF EXEMPLARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
APPROVED BY THE
JOINT DISSEMINATION REVIEW PANEL
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

WINTER 1980

Prepared for the
National Diffusion Network
Division of Educational Replication
United States Office of Education
by

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

MAR 7 1980

The descriptive entries in this catalog were taken from the Fall, 1979 edition of the National Diffusion Network's *Educational Programs That Work*.

Production of this catalog has been supported with federal funds from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, United States Office of Education, under contract #300-77-0415. The contents do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Office of Education, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government or the Laboratory.

Contents

INTRODUCTION	v
NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK (NDN) FACILITATORS	vii
SECONDARY BASIC SKILLS EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS	1
EXEMPLARY PROJECTS, BY STATE	37
NDN DEVELOPER/DEMONSTRATOR PROJECTS	39

Introduction

Outlined in this National Diffusion Network catalog are exemplary basic skills programs for secondary-level students, grades 7–12. The term "exemplary" is conferred only after a project has been reviewed by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel of the Education Division, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This Panel has responsibility for quality assurance, examining the evidence of both cognitive and affective evaluation presented by each project and judging its effectiveness. Positive endorsement by a majority of the attending Panel members constitutes approval, and a date of validation is assigned. Programs that continue development and submit additional evidence of effectiveness to the Panel carry two validation dates.* All program descriptions were drawn from the National Diffusion Network's sixth edition of *Educational Programs That Work*, Fall 1979.**

The NDN operates through two kinds of projects—Developer/Demonstrators and NDN Facilitators. Developer/Demonstrators (D/Ds) are exemplary projects that receive federal funds to provide training, materials, and technical assistance to those who adopt their programs. NDN Facilitators (one or more in every state) are the principal link between D/Ds and those seeking new programs. They help to identify suitable NDN programs and then assist with adoption, training, and operation. Many NDN Facilitators also help local school districts with other planning. A list of NDN Facilitators follows this introduction. They should be contacted for additional information on any project described in this catalog.

This catalog is restricted to programs in mathematics, reading, and writing. Twenty-two of the projects are Developer/Demonstrators. Not included are programs in any of those areas that were developed specifically for migrant or special education students, or programs in such areas as social studies, career or vocational education, or special interests that may be related to the basic skills. Consult *Educational Programs That Work*, Fall 1979, for additional programs.

A major purpose of this catalog is to stimulate communication among the federal, state, intermediate, local, and postsecondary agencies that share responsibility for improvement of education through nationwide dissemination. The NDN encourages the broadest possible use of these successful programs.

For further information on any of the programs described, contact the project directly or your NDN Facilitator.

---

*For further information about the Joint Dissemination Review Panel, write to the Executive Secretary, Joint Dissemination Review Panel, U.S. Office of Education, Room 3616, ROB 3, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202.

**Available from Order Department ($5.50 prepaid), Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1855 Folsom St., San Francisco, CA 94103.

National Diffusion Network (NDN) Facilitators*

NDN Facilitators, located in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, assist schools (both public and private) that are searching for ways to improve their programs. Readers of this catalog are encouraged to phone or visit the NDN Facilitator office within their state to learn more about available services and to request assistance in identifying programs that can meet their needs. NDN Facilitators can supply additional information on the exemplary programs described in this catalog, put educators directly in touch with project personnel for additional information, and help arrange for demonstrations, training, and follow-up assistance.

ALABAMA

R. Meade Guy
Alabama Facilitator Project
Alabama Information and Development System (AIDS)
Alabama Department of Education
Room 347 -- State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36130
(205) 832-3138

ALASKA

Betty Williams
Alaska State Facilitator Project
Alaska Department of Education
Pouch F, State Office Building
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-2814 or 2815

ARIZONA

L. Leon Webb
Arizona State Facilitator
Educational Diffusion Systems, Inc.
161 East First Street
Mesa, Arizona 85201
(602) 969-4880

ARKANSAS

Sara Murphy
Arkansas State Facilitator Project
Arkansas Department of Education
Communication and Dissemination Division
State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
(501) 370-5036

Mary B. Gunter
Arkansas State Facilitator Project
Region I
Boston Mount Cooperation
P.O. Drawer 248
Prairie Grove, Arkansas 72753
(501) 846-2206

Patrick Henry Flanagin
Arkansas State Facilitator Project
Region II
Marianna School District R&D Center
Route 2, Box 16C
Marianna, Arkansas 72360
(501) 295-5291

David Robinson
Region III
400 North Rock
Sheriden, Arkansas 72150
(501) 942-5433

CALIFORNIA

Ira Barkman or Ginna Lurton
California State Facilitator
State Department of Education
Exemplary Program Replication Unit
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 322-6797

COLORADO

Duane C. Webb
Colorado State Facilitator
830 South Lincoln
Longmont, Colorado 80501
(303) 772-4420

CONNECTICUT

Carolyn McNally
Connecticut Facilitator Project (CFP)
AREA Cooperative Educational Service
800 Dixwell Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut 06511
(203) 562-9967

DELAWARE

Peter Bachmann or Wilmer E. Wise
Delaware Facilitator Project
Planning, Research & Evaluation Division
State Department of Public Instruction
John G. Townsend Building
Dover, Delaware 19901
(302) 678-4583

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Susan Williams
District Facilitator Project
1101 - 15th Street, N.W.
Suite LL-70
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 331-1707

FLORIDA

Allan Scott
Florida Statewide Facilitator
PAEC
411 West Boulevard
Chipley, Florida 32428
(904) 638-4131

GEORGIA

India Lynn King or Mary Allison
Georgia Facilitator Center
226 Fain Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
(404) 542-3332

*Further information about the National Diffusion Network and NDN Facilitator strategies may be found in: NDN: A Success Story (LEA Associates, 80 S. Main St., Concord, NH 03301, $1.50 prepaid) and State Facilitator Profiles (Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1855 Folsom St., San Francisco, CA 94103).

HAWAII

Kellett Min
Hawaii State Facilitator
Hawaii State Department of Education
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804
(808) 548-3425

IDAHO

Ted L. Lindley
Idaho State Facilitator
Idaho State Department of Education
Len B. Jordan Office Building
Boise, Idaho 83720
(208) 384-2189

ILLINOIS

Shirley N. Menendez
Illinois Statewide Facilitator
1105 East Fifth Street
Metropolis, Illinois 62960
(618) 524-2664

INDIANA

Ted F. Newell
Indiana Facilitator Center
Logansport Community School Corp.
2829 George Street
Logansport, Indiana 46947
(219) 722-1754

IOWA

David C. Lidstrom
Iowa State Facilitator
Iowa Department of Public Instruction
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
(515) 281-3111

KANSAS

James H. Connett
Kansas State Facilitator Project
KEDDS/LINK
1847 N. Chautauqua
Wichita, Kansas 67214
(316) 685-0271

KENTUCKY

John C. Padgett
Kentucky State Facilitator
State Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Tower Office Building
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
(502) 564-4394

LOUISIANA

James R. Owens, Jr.
The Louisiana Facilitator Project
Louisiana State Department of Education
ESEA Title IV Bureau Office
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804
(504) 342-3375

MAINE

Robert G. Shafto
Maine Facilitator Center
P.O. Box 1391
Gardiner, Maine 04345
(207) 582-7211 or 7212

MARYLAND

Raymond H. Hartjen
Maryland Facilitator Project/Educational
Alternative Inc.
P.O. Box 265, Simms Landing Road
Port Tobacco, Maryland 20677
(301) 934-2992

MASSACHUSETTS

John Collins
Massachusetts State Facilitator
The NETWORK
290 South Main Street
Andover, Massachusetts 01810
(617) 470-1080

MICHIGAN

Deborah Clemmons
Michigan State Facilitator
Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48909
(517) 373-1806

Regional Supplemental Centers

William Banach
Macomb Regional Supplemental Center
44001 Garfield Road
Mt. Clemens, Michigan 48043
(313) 286-8800

Ron Berg
Cheboygan-Otsego-Presque Isle ISD
Basic Regional Supplemental Center
6065 Learning Lane
Indian River, Michigan 49749
(616) 238-9394

Richard D. Anderle
Kent Intermediate School District
Region 8 Supplemental Center
2650 East Beltline, S.E.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506
(616) 957-0250

Roy Butz
Oakland Intermediate School District
2100 Pontiac Lake Road
Pontiac, Michigan 48054
(313) 858-1940

Gerry Geik
Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District
Region 12 Supplemental Center
1819 E. Milham Road
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49002
(616) 381-4620 ext. 309

Bobbie Ann Robinson
Saginaw Intermediate School District
MERC (Mid-Eastern Regional Consortium)
6235 Gratiot Road
Saginaw, Michigan 48603
(517) 799-4733

Paul Kimball
Marquette-Alger Intermediate School District
Lighthouse Schools
427 W. College Avenue
Marquette, Michigan 49855
(906) 228-9400

(Michigan cont.)

Olga Moir
Wayne County Intermediate School District
Project VALUE
33500 Van Born Road
Wayne, Michigan 48184
(313) 326-9300

Shirley Rappaport
Bay-Arenac Intermediate School District
Region 6 Supplemental Center
4228 Two Mile Road
Bay City, Michigan 48706
(517) 686-4410

Sylvia Ruscett
Ottawa Intermediate School District
13565 Port Sheldon Road
Holland, Michigan 48423
(616) 399-6940 ext. 259

MINNESOTA

Gene Johnson or James Christianson
Northern and Central Minnesota State
Facilitator Project
524 North Third Street
Staples, Minnesota 56479
(218) 894-1930

Diane Lassman
Southeast Minnesota Facilitator Project
The EXCHANGE
166 Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 376-5297

Richard L. Peterson
State Facilitator Project
ESCU Office
Southwest State University
Marshall, Minnesota 56258
(507) 537-1481

MISSISSIPPI

Jerome P. Brock
Mississippi Facilitator Project
Bankers Trust Plaza Building, Suite 1112
P.O. Box 1801
Jackson, Mississippi 39205
(601) 948-1210

MISSOURI

Jolene Schulz or Bill Giddings
Missouri State Facilitator Center
Columbia Public School System
310 North Providence Road
Columbia, Missouri 65201
(314) 443-2561 ext. 218/238 or 449-8622

MONTANA

William E. Connett or Wayne Pyron
Montana State Facilitator Project
Office of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Helena, Montana 59601
(406) 449-3693

Cliff Harmala
Montana Regional Facilitator
1101 River Avenue
Glendive, Montana 59330
(406) 365-4422 or 449-5643

Jim Palmer
Montana Regional Facilitator
P.O. Box 3836
Missoula, Montana 59801
(406) 728-3248

Jim Watkins
Montana Regional Facilitator
1325 Fourth Avenue North
Great Falls, Montana 59401
(406) 761-4144

NEBRASKA

Mary Lou Palmer
Nebraska State Facilitator Project
Nebraska State Department of Education
P.O. Box 94987
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509
(402) 471-2637

NEVADA

Victor Hyden or Amy Heintz
Nevada State Facilitator Project
Nevada Department of Education
400 W. King Street
Capitol Complex
Carson City, Nevada 89710
(702) 885-5700

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Glendon C. Belden
New Hampshire Facilitator Center
80 South Main Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(603) 224-9461

NEW JERSEY

Robert Francis
New Jersey State Facilitator Project
Branch of Program Dissemination and Service
Division of School Programs
New Jersey State Department of Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(609) 292-8776 or 8779

NEW MEXICO

Lily A. Kliot or Sue Adams
DEEP: Diffusing Exemplary Educational Practices
in New Mexico
Department of Educational Foundations
College of Education
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
(505) 277-5204

NEW YORK

Robert N. King or Samuel Corsi, Jr.
New York State Facilitator Project
New York State Education Department, Room 235-M-EB
Albany, New York 12234
(518) 474-1280

Regional Facilitators

John Donovan
Education Assistant for Evaluation
410 East Willow Street
Syracuse, New York 13203
(315) 425-4284

(New York cont.)

Grace Fairlie
Supervisor of Curriculum
721 City Hall
Buffalo, New York 14202
(716) 842-4697

Evelyn Jones
Center for School Development
Board of Education
131 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201
(212) 596-8947

Eleanor Peck
Communications Assistant
City School District
Office of Urban Funded Programs
410 Alexander Street
Rochester, New York 14607
(716) 325-4560

Robert Raub
Madison-Oneida BOCES
Spring Road
Verona, New York 13478
(315) 363-8000

Richard Solomon
555 Warren Road
Ithaca, New York 14850
(607) 257-1555

Arthur Sullivan
Suffolk County #3 BOCES
507 Deer Park Road
Dix Hills, New York 11746
(516) 549-4900

Frank Thompson
Project Director
ECOS Training Institute
Box 369
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598
(914) 245-6919

Charles Weed
Regional Planning Center
1015 Watervliet-Shaker Road
Albany, New York 12205
(518) 456-9281

NORTH CAROLINA

Henry A. Helms, Jr.
Division of Development
State Department of Public Instruction
Education Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611
(919) 733-7018

Regional Facilitators

Glen Arrants
North Carolina Facilitator Center
102 Old Clyde Road
Canton, North Carolina 28716
(704) 648-6960 ext. 31

Richard Barnes
North Central Facilitator Center
P.O. Box 21889
Greensboro, North Carolina 27420
(919) 379-5764

Maxine Brown
Northeast Regional Education Center
Box 1028
Williamston, North Carolina 27892
(919) 792-5166

Robert R. Byrd
North Carolina Facilitator Service-
Southwest Site
619 Wall Street
Albemarle, North Carolina 28001
(704) 983-2127

Brenda Dail
Central Regional Education Center
Box 549
Knightdale, North Carolina 27545
(919) 266-9282

Josephine Spaulding
South Central Regional Center
P.O. Box 786
Carthage, North Carolina 28327
(919) 947-5871

Joe Webb
Southeast Regional Facilitator Service
Education Center-Room 200
612 College Street
Jacksonville, North Carolina 28540
(919) 455-8100

Facilitator
Northwest Regional Facilitative Service
P.O. Box 1308
North Wilkesboro, North Carolina 28659
(919) 667-2191

NORTH DAKOTA

Hank Landeis
North Dakota State Facilitator
Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505
(701) 224-2293

OHIO

Gordon Behm
Ohio Facilitator Center
The Ohio Department of Education
Division of Planning and Evaluation
65 South Front Street, Room 804
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 466-3825

OKLAHOMA

Kenneth Smith
Oklahoma Statewide Facilitator Project
Edmond Public Schools
1216 S. Rankin
Edmond, Oklahoma 73034
(405) 341-2246

OREGON

Dick Pedee
Oregon State Facilitator
Multnomah County Intermediate Education
District
220 S.E. 102nd Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97216
(503) 254-9925

PENNSYLVANIA

Richard Brickley or Carolyn Trohoski
R.I.S.E. - Pennsylvania State Facilitator
198 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406
(215) 265-6056

RHODE ISLAND

George McDonough
State Facilitator Center - R.I.S.F.C.
CIC Building
235 Promenade Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908
(401) 277-3840 or 6834

SOUTH CAROLINA

James R. Buckner
South Carolina Facilitator Project
South Carolina State Department of Education
Office of Federal Programs
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 758-3526

SOUTH DAKOTA

Gene K. Dickson
South Dakota State Facilitator
South Dakota Division of Elementary and
Secondary Education
Richard F. Kneip Building
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
(605) 773-3395

TENNESSEE

Martin McConnell or Charles M. Achilles
Tennessee Statewide Facilitator Project (TSFP)
College of Education/BERS
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
(615) 974-4165 or 2272

TEXAS

Patrick Martin
Texas Education Agency
201 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 475-5601

Robert Reeves
Region I Education Service Center
Diffusion Project
1900 West Schunior
Edinburg, Texas 78539
(512) 383-5611

Madalyn Cooke
Region II Education Service Center
109 North Chaparral
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401
(512) 883-9288

Bill Powell
Region III Education Service Center
1905 Leary Lane
Victoria, Texas 77901
(512) 575-1471

Charlie Henderson
Region IV Education Service Center
P.O. Box 863
Houston, Texas 77001
(713) 868-1051

Collene Simmons
Region V Education Service Center
P.O. Box 3546
Beaumont, Texas 77704
(713) 892-9562 ext. 34

Everett Youngblood
Region VI Education Service Center
Route 2, Box 33A
Possum Walk Road (FM1375)
Huntsville, Texas 77340
(713) 295-9161

Mike Owens
Region VII Education Service Center
P.O. Drawer 1622
Kilgore, Texas 75662
(214) 984-3071

Leroy Hendricks
Region VIII Education Service Center
100 North Riddle Street
Mt. Pleasant, Texas 75455
(214) 572-6676

Art Phillips
Region IX Education Service Center
3014 Old Seymour Road
Wichita Falls, Texas 76309
(817) 322-6928

Margaret Z. Faber
Region X Education Service Center
400 East Spring Valley Road
P.O. Box 1300
Richardson, Texas 75080
(214) 231-6301

Frank Buell or Mary F. Hull
Region XI Education Service Center
2821 Cullen Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76107
(817) 335-2441

Rosemary Richards
Region XII Education Service Center
401 Franklin
Waco, Texas 76703
(817) 756-7494

Carrie Heim
Region XIII Education Service Center
7703 North Lamar
Austin, Texas 78752
(512) 458-9131

Robert E. Maniss
Region XIV Education Service Center
P.O. Box 3258
Abilene, Texas 79604
(915) 677-2911

Vonell Huit
Region XV Education Service Center
P.O. Box 5199
San Angelo, Texas 76902
(915) 655-6551

Jack Shelton
Region XVI Education Service Center
1601 South Cleveland
P.O. Box 30600
Amarillo, Texas 79120
(806) 376-5521

Travis Brown
Region XVII Education Service Center
700 Texas Commerce Bank Building
Lubbock, Texas 79401
(806) 763-4127

Bill Whitfield
Region XVIII Education Service Center
P.O. Box 6020
Midland, Texas 79701
(915) 563-2380

State Facilitator
Region XIX Education Service Center
P.O. Box 10716
El Paso, Texas 79997
(915) 779-3737

(Texas cont.)

Betty Child
Region XX Education Service Center
1550 N.E. Loop 410
San Antonio, Texas 78209
(512) 828-3551

UTAH

Kenneth P. Lindsay
Utah State Facilitator Project
Utah State Board of Education
250 East Fifth South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 533-5431

VERMONT

Joseph M. O'Brien
Vermont State Facilitator
Bennington-Rutland Supervisory Union
Manchester Center, Vermont 05255
(802) 362-3346 or 472-6350

VIRGINIA

J. B. Linder, Jr. or Robert Foster
Virginia State Facilitator
Educational Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 562
Richmond, Virginia 23204
(804) 732-3584 or (803) 536-5932

WASHINGTON

Keith Wright
Washington State Facilitator
Yakima Public Schools
104 North Fourth Avenue
Yakima, Washington 98902
(509) 575-3234

WEST VIRGINIA

Kenny J. Smith
West Virginia State Facilitator
P.O. Box 1907
Elkins, West Virginia 26241
(304) 636-6918

WISCONSIN

George R. Glasrud
Wisconsin State Facilitator
Department of Public Instruction
Instructional Services Division
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702
(608) 266-2101

WYOMING

Charlene G. Stogsdill
Wyoming Innovative Network Schools-Facilitator
Laramie County School District #1
2810 House Avenue
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001
(307) 632-0591 ext. 134

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Phyllis Betz
Virgin Islands State Facilitator
Virgin Islands Department of Education
P.O. Box 630
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801
(809) 774-0100 ext. 208

PUERTO RICO

Jose Antonio Figueroa or Sylvia Rodriquez
Puerto Rico State Facilitator
Department of Education, Room 508
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919
(809) 759-8240

SECONDARY BASIC SKILLS EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS

ALTERNATE LEARNING PROJECT (ALP) - Rhode Island..... 3
A community-based alternative to traditional school, emphasizing basic skills, career education, performance-based graduation, and parent and student participation, that offers both a complete high school program and Special Focus Programs to supplement existing curricula.

PROJECT CATCH-UP - California..... 4
A diagnostic/prescriptive laboratory program in reading and/or math.

CATCH UP - KEEP UP - Arizona..... 5
A remedial reading program and inservice teacher training.

COMPUTER-ASSISTED-DIAGNOSTIC-PRESCRIPTIVE PROGRAM IN READING AND MATHEMATICS (CADPP) - Virginia..... 6
A computer-assisted management system providing diagnosis of basic needs in reading and mathematics and prescriptions to assist in teaching to those needs.

CONCEPTUALLY ORIENTED MATHEMATICS PROGRAM (COMP) - Missouri..... 7
A sequential small-group mathematics program designed to meet the needs of all children.

EVERY STUDENT EVERY DAY [formerly Expanded Services in Early Learning, Reading, and Mathematics] - Louisiana..... 8
A diagnostic/prescriptive program designed to meet the fundamental language, reading, and arithmetic skill needs of children in grades K-8 who score in the bottom CTBS quartile.

EXEMPLARY CENTER FOR READING INSTRUCTION (ECRI) - Utah..... 9
An inservice program for teachers of students of all ability levels in reading and language skills, with expectations of 95-100% mastery.

HIGHER HORIZONS 100 - Connecticut..... 10
A program for students with reading retardation problems, with a coordinated effort in language arts development in all content areas.

HIT: High Intensity Tutoring - Michigan..... 11
An individualized instruction program for sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade students identified as deficient in basic grade-level reading and/or mathematics skills.

HOSTS: Help One Student To Succeed - Washington..... 12
A diagnostic/prescriptive/tutorial approach to basic reading skills.

IMPROVEMENT OF BASIC READING SKILLS - Alabama..... 13
Reading centers providing an individualized approach to remedial reading for educationally deprived children.

IMPROVING ACHIEVEMENT (READING) THROUGH USE OF TEACHERS AND TEACHER AIDES - Utah..... 14
A personalized and concentrated reading improvement program for secondary students.

INTENSIVE READING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (IRIP) - Illinois..... 15
A program for staff development of elementary school teachers intended to upgrade reading teaching skills.

LEARNING TO READ BY READING - California..... 16
A unique method of teaching reading to sub-par achievers at upper-elementary through junior college levels who have failed to progress with the use of conventional methods and materials, especially useful in alternative schools.

MATH LABORATORIES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS - South Carolina..... 17
A laboratory approach to teaching basic mathematical skills to underachievers.

MATTESON FOUR-DIMENSIONAL READING PROGRAM - Illinois..... 18
A multitext, individualized, comprehensive reading skills-developmental reading program for grades 4-8.

the NEW JERSEY WRITING PROJECT - New Jersey..... 19
A teacher-training program that improves student writing.

PEGASUS: Personalized Educational Growth and Achievement with Selective Utilization of Staff - Illinois..... 20
A management program in reading personalized to meet students' needs.

PRE-ALGEBRA DEVELOPMENT CENTERS - Illinois..... 21
A basic conceptual/computational skills program in mathematics designed to serve the dual purpose of preparing students for algebra as they develop proficiencies in the basic skills.

the PROCESS OF TEACHING BASIC READING SKILLS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS - California..... 22
A program providing inservice workshops to help secondary teachers manage class time and student behavior in basic reading classes.

project R-3: Readiness, Relevancy and Reinforcement - California..... 23
A motivational basic skills program that interrelates the reading and mathematics curricula through gaming/simulation activities involving career awareness.

READING/ENGLISH ROTATION PROJECT - Georgia..... 24
A rotating classroom approach to teaching reading skills to students, grades 6-9. Not a "pull-out" model.

project READING IMPROVEMENT - North Carolina..... 25
A laboratory and tutorial project attacking the problem of reading deficiencies of children in grades 2-8.

READING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM -- SECONDARY SCHOOLS READING LABORATORY - West Virginia..... 26
An individualized reading skills program.

READING -- INDIVIDUALIZED REMEDIAL LABORATORIES/MATH -- INDIVIDUALIZED REMEDIATION - Georgia..... 27
A project designed to provide continuous diagnosis of student needs and daily prescriptions for learning improvement.

RIGHT TO READ: Wilson Junior High School - California..... 28
An effort to eliminate illiteracy and turn kids on to reading.

SEAPORT: Student Education Assuring Positive Organized Reading Techniques - Rhode Island..... 29
A program applying school-based and home/school liaison approaches to remedial reading problems.

STAMM: Systematic Teaching And Measuring Mathematics - Colorado..... 30
A complete mathematics curriculum for kindergarten through Algebra II-Trigonometry, including alternative high school courses.

STUDENT TEAM LEARNING: Intergroup Relations - Maryland..... 31
A set of instructional techniques placing students in four- or five-member multi-ethnic learning teams to master basic skills.

STUDENT TEAMS-ACHIEVEMENT DIVISIONS (STAD): Language Arts - Maryland..... 32
An instructional technique placing students in four- or five-member heterogeneous learning teams to master basic language skills.

TEAMS-GAMES-TOURNAMENT (TGT) - Maryland..... 33
An instructional method using cooperative teams and game tournaments to increase student learning of basic skills.

UPSTAIRS SCHOOL - Oregon..... 34
A program intended to improve the reading ability of educationally disadvantaged students.

VRP: Reading Power in the Content Areas - Minnesota..... 35
A staff-development project designed to help content area teachers minimize the gap between student reading abilities and reading requirements of printed instructional material.

PROJECT ALTERNATE LEARNING PROJECT (ALP)

descriptors Basic Skills, Career Education, Decision Making Skills, Educational Alternatives, Individualized Instruction, Parent Participation, Performance Based Education, School Community Cooperation, School Organization, Secondary Education, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for students of all abilities, grades 9-12. It has been used in other settings (middle school and adult level), but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description *A community-based alternative to traditional school, emphasizing basic skills, career education, performance-based graduation, and parent and student participation, that offers both a complete high school program and Special Focus Programs to supplement existing curricula.*

ALP, a comprehensive public secondary school, provides students with an individualized basic skills program, a college preparatory course, community-wide career exploration activities, and a broad arts program. The emphasis throughout is on continuous personal counseling and student responsibility. Students enroll in ALP by choice. Participants are selected by lottery, using such factors as race, family income, sex, and grade level to achieve a population that reflects the city and school system profile.

ALP has five major objectives: to improve student performance in basic academic skills; to improve student career decision-making skills; to provide needed counseling for planning, evaluation, and support of student activity; to involve students and parents in school governance and decision making; and to maximize learning opportunities in the community.

Graduation requirements at ALP involve: the ALP Life Skills Competency Assessment (an evaluation of individual student competencies in practical, real-life situations where applied performance is required) and the ALP Core Diploma requirements (students must pass proficiency exams in English, math, and science, earn credit in U.S. history, and complete a minimum number of courses and educational activities).

The ALP model consists of two major components: adoption and Special Focus Programs. The five essential elements of an ALP adoption are: project administration and design; curriculum development; counseling and student evaluation; community resource development; and governance and decision making. Special Focus Programs are designed to supplement existing curricula. ALP offers five: Family Life Peer Counseling Service; College Local Educational Agency Relationship (CLEAR) Program; ALP Child Care Center; Competency-Based Education and Basic Skills; and Transitional Program for Special Needs Students.

evidence of effectiveness External evaluations of ALP show that the project has greatly reduced absenteeism and dropout rates. Sixty-five percent of ALP students go on to four-year colleges; many of these students normally would not have pursued further education. Other measures have shown improved attitudes toward self and schooling. (Some test instruments used: California Achievement Tests, Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Adult Performance Level Survey.)

implementation requirements The scope of the ALP program provides for a variety of adoption and technical assistance options ranging from full adoption of the complete five-element program to technical assistance in one or more of the Special Focus Programs. Adoption of the total program requires staffing at school district teacher/pupil ratio; a minimum of three days start-up training at adopter site; and a separate facility or a separate location within the school building for the alternate program. Special Focus Program adoption requirements depend on the program adopted and the needs of the district and adopting school.

financial requirements Staff may consist of reassigned personnel or new staff, full-time or part-time, consistent with district teacher/pupil ratio. Available school district equipment is sufficient. Training materials are provided at no charge. Program materials include those already found in most classrooms, as well as materials commercially available.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Services available free of charge include: awareness sessions; consultation for program design and development; consultation for proposal and funding applications; inservice training for personnel carrying out adaptions of the ALP model; technical assistance for implementation of ALP adoptions; resources and materials necessary for successful program adoption; and consultation for evaluation and development of evaluative methodologies.

contact Margaret E. Finn; Dissemination Services, Alternate Learning Project; Providence School Department; 321 Eddy St.; Providence, RI 02908. (401) 456-9196.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 74-86 Approved: 6/6/74

Compiled Summer 1978

PROJECT PROJECT CATCH-UP

descriptors Diagnostic Teaching, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Elementary Secondary Education, Individualized Instruction, Learning Laboratories, Mathematics Instruction, Remedial Instruction, Remedial Reading Programs, Resource Room Programs, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for students in the lowest quartile in reading or math, grades K-8. Adopting sites have successfully extended the laboratory to serve students at other achievement levels and in grades K-9, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description *A diagnostic/prescriptive laboratory program in reading and/or math.*

Project Catch-Up is a laboratory program designed to provide remedial instruction to improve the achievement in reading and/or math skills of children who test in the lowest quartile in these areas.

Classroom and laboratory teachers work closely to identify program participants, and formulate a laboratory schedule that does not cause any child to miss reading or math in the regular classroom.

Laboratory teachers identify individual needs by means of diagnostic testing. They then select materials and methods from a wide variety of high-interest resources available in the laboratory to meet the child's needs. Children spend an average of one half hour per day in the laboratory, in groups of one to three, working with the teacher on skill deficiencies. The program is designed in such a way that each child experiences success, and moves toward the acquisition of more difficult skills armed with increased confidence.

A wide variety of readily available instructional materials and equipment, selected by project teachers, is available in the laboratory. Results can be achieved with limited resources if a diagnostic/prescriptive method is used in a success-oriented environment. Staff have identified materials according to priority.

With a few well-developed techniques, teachers have made participating children feel that the lab is "their lab" -- to such a degree that it has become necessary to have guest days to satisfy the desire of other children to participate even in a small way in the laboratory. Project Catch-Up's special events for parents consistently draw more parents than any other school function.

(This project has been described in a Project Information Package.)

evidence of effectiveness The project utilizes pre- and posttesting (Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills in reading and math). For the past five years, the median student has consistently gained 1.5 months in reading and math skills for each month in the program (data validated by Research Management Corporation). Originating-site students are low achievers in a low-income urban community. Similar gains by adopters in rural and middle-income schools have been validated. Annual evaluation data available.

implementation requirements A school district interested in adopting or adapting Project Catch-Up should be able to: provide a laboratory of any size (we started in a closet, but at present have a classroom); administer diagnostic tests to participating children; provide professional instruction to meet diagnosed needs; use high-interest materials insofar as they are available. The project can be adopted for a grade level or a school. It can offer reading instruction, math, or both.

financial requirements Tests and instructional materials: $4.50-$20 per child, depending on funds available. The project itself sells no materials; all are commercially available and thoroughly tested; many are already found in most schools. Equipment: three high-interest instructional machines, maximum cost $250 per laboratory; most schools already have at least one such machine. Staff needs may be met by reassignment of personnel in any school with Title I funding.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Visitors welcome by appointment. Awareness materials, other sample materials, and technical assistance in securing funding are available at no charge. Staff are available for out-of-state awareness conferences (costs to be arranged). Inservice available at project site and out of state (costs to be arranged). A PIP (a complete three-ring binder prepared through the United States Office of Education) is available for school districts that want a step-by-step guide to adaptation.

contact Fay Harbison; Newport-Mesa Unified School District; P.O. Box 1368; Newport Beach, CA 92660. (714) 760-3300.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 34 Approved: 4/4-5/73

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT CATCH UP - KEEP UP

descriptors

Diagnostic Teaching, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Elementary Secondary Education, Individualized Instruction, Inservice Teacher Education, Remedial Reading Programs, Resource Room Programs, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by JDRP for students in grades 5-8 who are reading two or more years below grade level. It has been used in other settings with students in grades K-4 and 9-12, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description

A remedial reading program and inservice teacher training.

The goal of this project is to raise the reading level of children who read below their grade level -- one month growth for each month in the program. The population in the community is in the lower-middle income range and highly mobile. Children who score two or more years below grade level on the Gates-MacGinitie reading test receive instruction in small groups from reading specialists, in the reading lab and/or in the classroom. Reading specialists spend at least 50% of their instructional time working in the special reading lab. Approximately 50% of their time is spent working with children in regular classrooms in concert with classroom teachers to provide inservice teacher training. When the training occurs in the classroom, the regular teachers and aides are able to learn new techniques and strategies for teaching reading. This profits not only the target student but all students in the class. Students meet with the reading specialist for 20-50 minutes four days each week and remain in the program for at least one semester.

Instruction in reading is individualized for each student using the Flowing Wells Reading Support System, which carefully diagnoses a student's reading deficits, provides prescriptive activities, and includes an evaluation procedure to determine the student's progress. The reading labs serve as locations for specialized instruction, as well as a reading materials resource center for teachers. The reading specialists offer demonstrations, workshops, and seminars for teachers and provide creative reading materials such as board games, posters, audiotapes, and self-paced exercises for loan to students, teachers, and parents. The reading labs are decorated in lively and interesting fashion with unique niches and private retreats to enhance the appeal of reading. Students are evaluated on an ongoing basis using the Flowing Wells Reading Support System. In this manner of continuous monitoring, a current record of student growth in reading skills is readily at hand for the reading specialist and classroom teacher. Gates-MacGinitie standardized reading tests are administered three times per year as a means of determining normative growth.

(This project has been described in a Project Information Package.)

evidence of effectiveness

In 1974, Gates-MacGinitie reading scores collected during 1973-74 from students in grades 5-8 enrolled in Title I funded schools were submitted to JDRP. Data analysis indicated that students who remained in the program for at least three months made significant gains in their reading level. From the beginning of the program, students have met or exceeded the program goal: at least 75% of the students gain one month in reading level for each month in the program.

implementation requirements

This program involves the entire school system. It would be difficult for a single teacher to adopt only a portion of it. Basic implementation requirements are: one highly qualified and motivated reading specialist for every 225 students; a separate comfortable work area for small reading groups; a reading management system; active support from top-level administrators; teachers willing to release children to attend labs and willing to work with reading specialists; inservice training for administrators and reading specialists; administration of evaluation forms before and after the program.

financial requirements

Costs budgeted for the 1975-76 school year based on 225 students in the program were approximately $370 per student. Most of the cost is salaries for reading specialists. The Flowing Wells Reading Support System (RSS) is available for $25.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no cost. Visitors are welcome at project site by appointment. Project staff are available to attend out-of-state awareness meetings (costs to be negotiated). Training is provided at project site (adopter pays only its own costs). Training is also conducted at adopter sites (expenses must be paid).

contact James L. Neeley, Coordinator; Dissemination Project; Project Catch Up - Keep Up; Flowing Wells Schools; 1444 W. Prince Rd.; Tucson, AZ 85705. (602) 887-1100, ext. 232.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 74-120 Approved: 12/16/74

PROJECT COMPUTER-ASSISTED-DIAGNOSTIC-PRESCRIPTIVE PROGRAM IN READING AND MATHEMATICS (CADPP)

descriptors

Compensatory Education, Computer Managed Instruction, Criterion Referenced Tests, Diagnostic Teaching, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Elementary Education, Individualized Programs, Mathematics Instruction, Reading Instruction, Remedial Instruction, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by JDRP as a reading program for grades 3-9 and as a math program for grades 3-7.

description

A computer-assisted management system providing diagnosis of basic needs in reading and mathematics and prescriptions to assist in teaching to those needs.

CADPP is a remedial program in reading and mathematics designed to supplement the regular school program. The Title I skills continuum builds upon skill areas taught in the regular school program, but it uses different basal materials. Both regular and Title I curricula develop and utilize teacher-made games, worksheets, and manipulative materials. No special equipment and no single commercial program is used in the classroom, because the staff believe that diverse learning styles require a variety of supplemental materials to reinforce skills. CADPP has three major components: a diagnostic approach to individualized instruction, a learning center approach to classroom management, and an individual prescriptive approach to instruction in areas of need.

Essential elements of the program include diagnosis with a criterion-referenced test; use of a computer to develop an Individualized Educational Plan; an instructional management system incorporating learning stations; and maintenance of a continuing computer update of instructional activities and pupil progress.

Use of a computer to perform the clerical duties allows teachers more time for instruction. Intense staff development provides the computer with a data bank containing information on student characteristics (functioning levels, interests, and effective learning modes) and learning material characteristics (difficulty levels and teaching modalities). After diagnostic testing and teacher observation define skill needs, the computer matches the two sets of characteristics to prepare the prescription best suited to each individual student. The student receives individualized instruction and the teacher receives technical assistance in effective implementation of the student's program.

evidence of effectiveness

Three-year fall-to-fall testing (1976-78) with the Science Research Associates Achievement Series documented positive trends through standard score gains. Grade 3 students showed the highest gains in reading, with 23 NCEs; grades 6 and 7 evidenced 8 NCEs. Gains in math ranged between 22 NCEs for grades 4 and 5 and 6 NCEs for grade 3. Overall, the gap between scores of participating and non-participating students was narrowed.

implementation requirements

CADPP can be adopted by a single classroom unit or by several units. Extensive staff development and training in criterion-reference design and development, instructional management systems, performance/process evaluation, monitoring, and individualized instruction via the learning station approach to management are required.

financial requirements

Based on 468 pupils, start-up cost is $45.51 per pupil. In addition, cost for implementing a criterion-referenced testing program and instructional management system is $13.64 per pupil. Continuation costs are $10.32 per pupil, based on 630 students.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no cost. Visitors are welcome at project site by appointment. Project staff may attend a limited number of out-of-state awareness meetings. Training is conducted for a limited number of adopters at adopter sites.

contact Debra J. Glowinski, Federal Programs Director; Title I Office; Box 292; Dillwyn, VA 23936. (804) 983-2714 or -2863.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 79-15 Approved 6/12/79

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT CONCEPTUALLY ORIENTED MATHEMATICS PROGRAM (COMP)

descriptors Basic Skills, Cooperative Planning, Elementary Secondary Education, Mathematics Instruction, Performance Based Education, Sequential Programs, Small Group Instruction, Teaching Methods, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for students of all abilities, grades 1-8. It has been used for grades 9-12, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description *A sequential small-group mathematics program designed to meet the needs of all children.*

The Conceptually Oriented Mathematics Program is a management system that provides a list of sequential skills to be mastered in each of the basic skills areas. It is designed to meet individual needs through small-group instruction.

Students are tested to determine their individual strengths and weaknesses, and are grouped accordingly. The program provides continuous progress through 25 instructional levels. Ten broad concept areas are developed through these 25 levels. Each level has been broken into two or more steps. (Step Z in each level provides additional materials for the highly motivated student.)

The program utilizes cooperative planning and teaching. The ideal instructional situation is one in which each teacher has no more than two instructional groups. It is the intent of the program to encourage teachers to be creative in their teaching and to adapt the program to the learning styles of their students.

evidence of effectiveness Iowa Test of Basic Skills administered 1971-72 to COMP students grades 1-8 (September and May). Seventy-seven percent increased their percentile rankings pre to post. Further annual testing of the same students showed continued gains: 64% in 1972-73, and 58% in 1973-74.

implementation requirements One day of training prior to the implementation of COMP. (All teachers and administrators involved in the program should attend.) One day of training following implementation of the program. (Adopting school's needs will determine date.) One staff member to serve as project contact person and coordinator.

financial requirements Exclusive of textbooks and the coordinator's salary, the basic costs are: an average of two guidebooks per teacher, at $9 per book (includes postage and handling), and the cost of reproducing tests. Additional materials for instruction and enrichment can be added as finances become available.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no charge. Arrangements can be made for visitors to see COMP in action at several adopter schools. Training will be conducted by a consultant from Project COMP at adopter site only (costs to be arranged). Staff members will be available to present COMP at out-of-state conferences (costs to be arranged).

contact Alta M. Harness, Director; COMP Consultants, Inc.; 916 Tandy Ave. #1; Columbia, MO 65201. (314) 449-0881.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 74-114 Approved: 12/6/74

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT EVERY STUDENT EVERY DAY [formerly Expanded Services in Early Learning, Reading, and Mathematics]

descriptors

Basic Skills, Diagnostic Teaching, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Elementary Secondary Education, Individualized Instruction, Language Arts, Low Achievers, Mathematics Instruction, Precision Teaching, Remedial Instruction, Special Classes, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by JDRP for low achievers in grades K-8.

description

A diagnostic/prescriptive program designed to meet the fundamental language, reading, and arithmetic skill needs of children in grades K-8 who score in the bottom CTBS quartile.

Ongoing diagnosis of pupil need is the core of this program. Students are guided through graded learning experiences until they achieve mastery. Each day's teaching-learning experience is specific to each child. Both teachers and paraprofessionals are used to maintain a ratio of four or five children per adult. An optical mark reader that scores each teaching practice or exercise the moment the student finishes it makes immediate shifts in teaching strategy possible and acts as a strong motivator for students and teacher.

Students attend special classes for 45 minutes daily. Each student's program provides three changes of activity during the period to ensure full concentration during his or her attention span. The program is an instructional management system using every possible strategy to ensure that the right instruction reaches each student at the moment it can be most effective. Both specially developed and commercially available materials are used. Test and practice materials copyrighted as "Precision Teaching Program" form the major part of the program. Some commercially available materials have been adapted for machine scoring, and teachers and aides are shown ways of developing their own materials.

Inservice work with teachers and aides is a very important part of the program. A week-long workshop before the start of the school year is followed by biweekly half-day meetings. Teachers and aides are taught to individualize instruction, recognize and teach to each student need, use commerical materials properly, and build their own materials.

This basic skills program is self-correcting; it draws attention to specific learning problems and indicates where help is needed. In 10 years, more than 1,500 pages of test and special exercises have been prepared. The self-correcting feature gives the program potential for meeting the instructional needs of any group of students in any region.

evidence of effectiveness

Scores on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) for the years 1976-77 and 1977-78 show average improvement of 16 percentile rankings for 2,400 children in the reading program, 20 percentile rankings for 900 children in math, and 50 percentile rankings for 440 children in the kindergarten language program.

implementation requirements

The reading program uses a teacher and an aide who work with five groups of 10-12 students per day. The math program can operate in the same way or with a paraprofessional tutor working with five groups of five students. The language program also operates with tutors working with five groups. The reading and math programs are geared to an optical mark reader for scoring exercises. This equipment is available on a monthly rental basis. Special materials developed for the program are available from Precision Teaching Associates.

financial requirements

St. Mary Parish serves more than 2,000 students per year in its Title I programs. The per-pupil cost, including all salaries, is under $500 per year. Start-up costs are slightly higher.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials (brochure, slide-tape presentation) are available at no cost. Visitors are welcome by appointment at project site and additional demonstration sites in home state and out of state. Project staff are available to attend out-of-state awareness meetings (costs to be negotiated). Training is provided at project site (adopter pays only its own costs). Training is also conducted at adopter site (costs to be negotiated).

contact Darryl Boudreaux, Federal Project Administrator, or Carlton M. Singleton, Project Director; St. Mary Parish School Board; P.O. Box 1239; Morgan City, LA 70380. (504) 384-1250.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 78-198 Approved: 11/27/78

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT EXEMPLARY CENTER FOR READING INSTRUCTION (ECRI)

descriptors

Classroom Techniques, Diagnostic Teaching, Elementary Secondary Education, Individualized Instruction, Inservice Teacher Education, Language Arts, Parent Participation, Performance Based Education, Reading Instruction, Self Concept, Teaching Methods, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by JDRP for teachers who teach students of all abilities, grades K-12, and adults, mono- or multilingual, during reading and language arts instruction (including content reading), in suburban, urban, and rural areas, and at all socioeconomic levels. Also for paraprofessionals, parents, and peers who tutor students at school or at home under supervision of teachers.

description

An inservice program for teachers of students of all ability levels in reading and language skills, with expectations of 95-100% mastery.

ECRI's original purposes in 1966 still exist: to identify critical teacher behavior essential to preventing reading failure, to provide inservice education for teachers geared to the research findings, and to disseminate this information. Teacher behaviors identified to date include abilities to: elicit correct responses from nonresponding pupils, establish high mastery levels of responses with performance and rate as criteria, correlate language arts activities to increase responses and save time, utilize effective management and monitoring systems, and diagnose and prescribe instantly when errors or no responses occur. Techniques are incorporated into specific directives during reading, oral language, spelling, dictation, creative writing, and penmanship instruction. Student advancement depends upon rate of mastery. A student progresses in practicing new skills and in working with materials independently of other students. No student waits for another. In small groups based upon instructional reading levels, students are instructed in those language skills that they will need in future work. Individual conferences are held daily. Students are reminded of the skills they have been taught, the skills they have mastered, and the skills they will be expected to master through the Review (part of every skills instruction period). The teacher teaches new skills at least one mastery test in advance of the student who is passing the tests most rapidly, and reviews instruction for students on the lowest mastery test. Performance is individually measured with the mastery test. Absenteeism is not the problem it can be in the traditional classroom. No procedural changes need occur for a teacher to provide for the returning student. Students' attention is sustained with the momentum of the teacher directives during instruction and reinforcement offered during practice time. Overt responses help students remain on-task. The structure of the scheduling, record-keeping, and multisensory instruction also keeps students motivated. Criteria for passing a mastery test are identical for all students, regardless of their reading levels. No student is made to feel less capable than another student. The teacher selects only those behavior management techniques that build the student's self-concept. Instruction is provided by ECRI so teachers can utilize the critical teacher behaviors, develop the management system for mastery and individualization, and teach reading and language skills effectively.

evidence of effectiveness

Project was validated over three years (1971-74) with more than 700 pupils in four Utah districts. First-graders are reading at 3.8; second graders average 95th to 99th percentile; clinic pupils average four months' gain per month; Title I pupils average 1.4 to 3.2 years' gains per year; secondary students average 2.5 years' gains per year. Data available upon request. Some tests used: SAT, Metropolitan, California Achievement, Gates-MacGinitie.

implementation requirements

A five- to ten-day preparatory inservice education program with one ECRI staff person for 20-25 trainees is desirable. Program includes lecture and practice sessions, preparation of materials for classroom use, and teaching pupils in a simulated setting. Following this, periodic visits by ECRI staff to trainees' classrooms to demonstrate, model, and monitor are desirable. The length of time to replicate the ECRI model varies. Existing district reading materials may be used. Supplies for teachers and pupils are those usually found in schools. ECRI has 16 self-instructional teacher-training workbooks and kits if inservice education is not desired.

financial requirements

At initial awareness sessions, time is provided without cost (travel expenses must be paid). For inservice programs and classroom monitoring, time and some travel expenses can be provided to a limited number of adopters. Some inservice and monitoring time is available without charge, but adopters pay all travel costs. Self-instructional workbooks: $6.95 and $9.95, from ECRI. Mastery tests: 20¢ each; can be reproduced. ECRI staff time: $185 a day plus expenses.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Catalog of available materials and awareness materials available upon request. Visitors welcome during school year at sites throughout U.S. Week-long training seminars for teachers, supervisors, and administrators conducted quarterly in Salt Lake City and adopter districts. ECRI inservice also includes university classes (teachers pay tuition). Seminars for teachers of teachers conducted biannually. Three-week inservice program held each summer in Salt Lake City. A teacher-training internship program and a teacher-training exchange program with ECRI assist local districts and service centers to develop demonstration teachers.

contact Ethna R. Reid, Director; Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction; 2888 Highland Dr.; Salt Lake City, UT 84106. (801) 486-5083 or 278-2334.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 74-48 Approved: 5/23/74

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT HIGHER HORIZONS 100

descriptors

Behavior Change, Cooperative Planning, Counseling, Interdisciplinary Approach, Language Arts, Remedial Reading Programs, Secondary Education, Self Concept, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by JDRP for ninth grade students with reading retardation problems. It has been used in other settings with seventh, eighth, and tenth grade students with reading retardation problems, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description

A program for students with reading retardation problems, with a coordinated effort in language arts development in all content areas.

The primary goal of the reading section of the program is to enable a student to make eight months' reading progress during the school year, and thereby regain lost ground. Other goals are improvement of speech, mathematics, science, and social studies, as well as helping students adjust to high school behavior patterns, expanding background of experience, and improving self-concept. After completing one year in the program, students are evaluated and may return to the regular school program. Enrollees are within normal range of intelligence and without serious emotional problems but have one to four years of reading retardation. The speech of many is affected by a second language or dialect. Students are counseled frequently by the Higher Horizons counselor and instructors. The counselor-student ratio is one counselor to 100 students. Collaboration between instructors in the various subjects makes it possible to remedy weaknesses in language arts and other classes.

evidence of effectiveness

Pre/posttesting (September and May) uses Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) for grades 7-9 and CTBS for grade 10. A Pupil Self-Rating Scale is also used. Attendance is higher for students in program over regular students, based on a variable school average. Average reading gain for program has been 1.5 years per group. Evaluation is conducted by Central Administration.

implementation requirements

The Higher Horizons concept employs teachers in the core subject areas of reading, English, language arts, math, science, and social studies. This cluster of basic skills developers functions as a school-within-a-school, making its own determinations about grouping, curriculum development, cultural enrichment, and career awareness. Ongoing inservice meetings and summer workshops allow for staff development and interdisciplinary coordination.

financial requirements

Approximately $250 per pupil over and above the cost of students in regular school program.

services available

No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

No awareness materials are available. Visitors are welcome by appointment. No training is conducted at the project site. Training may be conducted out of state (exemplary project staff costs must be paid). Project staff may be able to attend out-of-state conferences (expenses must be paid).

Alternate contact: Robert Nearine, Title I Director; Hartford Board of Education; 249 High St.; Hartford, CT 06103. (203) 566-6074.

contact

John Di Benedetto, Resource Coordinator; Higher Horizons 100; Hartford Public High School; 55 Forest St.; Hartford, CT 06105. (203) 278-5920.

Developmental Funding: State Aid to Disadvantaged Children USOE JDRP No. 74-26 Approved: 4/29/74

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT HIT: High Intensity Tutoring

descriptors

Cross Age Teaching, Disadvantaged Youth, Individualized Instruction, Junior High Schools, Mathematics Instruction, Motivation Techniques, Peer Teaching, Reading Instruction, Remedial Instruction, Tutoring, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by JDRP for grades 6-8.

description

An individualized instruction program for sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade students identified as deficient in basic grade-level reading and/or mathematics skills.

HIT centers provide an individualized instruction program designed (in the reading center) to develop vocabulary and comprehension skills and (in math center) to increase computational abilities, problem-solving abilities, and understanding of mathematical concepts. Sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade students identified as deficient in reading and/or mathematics are selected for HIT participation on the basis of performance at least one year below grade level on standard tests and by observations of the classroom teacher. The HIT method actively involves tutors, tutees, a certified teacher, and two paraprofessional aides. Tutoring focuses on peer-teaching and reinforcement techniques developed primarily from principles of programmed instruction. Tutors from grades 7 and 8 assist sixth-grade tutees in developing grade-level skills and reinforce correct performance. This interaction also helps the tutors upgrade their own skills.

Tutees in the program during sixth grade are given priority selection as tutors in seventh and eighth grade when skill deficiencies in those tutees still exist. This highlights the importance of reciprocity in the teaching-learning relationship, despite the small differences in ability between tutors and tutees. The two basic HIT Center components are the instructional system and the motivational system. The primary features of the instruction program are daily calculation of the percentage of correct responses for each tutee and use of instructional materials that carefully control introduction of new concepts and incorporate frequent review. The motivational system is crucial to optimal student progress. Tutees receive points for correct responses which accumulate in a "bank book" and are redeemable for tangible rewards. Tutors receive points and rewards on the basis of attendance.

(This project has been described in a Project Information Package.)

evidence of effectiveness

Evaluation data show that gains in math and reading exceeded expected gains for nonparticipants, and moved participants closer to national norm. Gains ranged from 1.2 to 3.7 months per each month in the program for both tutees and tutors on the Wide Range Achievement Test.

implementation requirements

Staffing: each center is staffed by one certified teacher and two paraprofessionals. Two of the most respected teachers already in each school are chosen by the principal and project director. Aides should be high-potential people because they do work similar to that of teachers. Tutors must be two grade-equivalent years ahead of tutees. Facilities/installation: center classroom should be located near students' regular classes. Approximately 10 pairs of student desks are needed. The room should have areas for display materials. Bookcases, material shelves, teacher's desk, and file cabinets are needed.

financial requirements

Yearly operating budget for a reading center is approximately $26,000, or $200 per pupil considering tutees only. If tutors are also considered (they benefit from program), per-pupil costs are cut approximately in half. Yearly budget for operating math centers is approximately $25,000, or $175 per pupil for tutees. Operational costs are approximately 85% personnel-related. Start-up costs are approximately $5,000 per center.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no cost. Visitors are welcome October through May. Project staff are available to attend out-of-state awareness meetings (expenses are paid). Training is provided at project site (adopter pays only its own costs). Training is also conducted at adopter site (costs to be negotiated).

contact Clarence L. Stone, Acting Director, State and Federal Projects, or Greg Byndbrian, Dissemination Specialist; Highland Park School District; 20 Bartlett; Highland Park, MI 48023. (313) 956-0160.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 74-9 Approved: 1/8/74

Updated Summer 1979

PROJECT HOSTS: Help One Student To Succeed

descriptors Basic Skills, Diagnostic Teaching, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Elementary Secondary Education, Individualized Instruction, Remedial Reading Programs, Resource Centers, Resource Room Programs, Tutorial Programs, Validated Programs, Volunteers

target audience Approved by JDRP for students who need remedial reading instruction, grades 2-12. It has been used in other settings with kindergarten and first-grade students, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description *A diagnostic/prescriptive/tutorial approach to basic reading skills.*

The HOSTS program operates from a learning resource center staffed by a reading specialist and an aide. Students in the HOSTS program are first evaluated; then individual prescriptions are developed, matching coded instructional materials to identified reading deficiencies. Informal reading inventories are used to screen and identify students. Each student in the project is then given a number of criterion-referenced tests to pinpoint individual reading deficiencies. From these tests a reading profile is developed by the specialist, recording the student's ability levels in the various skills areas. Individual lessons are developed from this profile. The HOSTS Cross Referencing Manuals are used by the instructional staff to plan prescriptive programming tailored to individualized needs. In addition, specific directions for tutor implementation of the prescribed program lessons are included in the student profiles. Daily student progress is recorded by the tutors and incorporated into the profile as well. Teaching procedures in the HOSTS program are designed to enable teachers to discover the abilities of each student and then allow the student to advance at his/her individual learning rate. The instructional climate is humane and reflects concern for each student's worth. Community volunteers work as tutors on a one-to-one basis with students, following prescriptions developed for each student by the reading specialist.

evidence of effectiveness Program evaluation consists of normative (Gates-MacGinitie, CTBS) and criterion-referenced tests. Student achievement scores indicate that, on the average, students doubled their learning rate while in HOSTS. Specific gains by grade levels are available in a detailed report. (Financial and evaluation data collected 1973-76.) Data from adoption sites indicate student gains averaged over 14 NCE (Normal Curve Equivalency) scores.

implementation requirements Potential adopting districts are selected on the basis of the following criteria: needs assessment; district's resources (commitment); evaluation plan; willingness to serve as a model for others. Potential adopters will be asked to send key personnel to visit the developer project. Upon completion of the visitation period, those districts that remain interested may apply to become HOSTS sites.

financial requirements Start-up cost ranges from $30 to $115 per pupil. Continuation cost ranges from 50¢ to $12 per pupil per year, depending upon existing resources. (Figures based on 2,000 target pupils.)

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials available free. Instructional materials have been correlated to a skill continuum. HOSTS Cross Referencing Manuals, ranging from readiness through junior high, are available at $195 per set. A tutor training manual is $20 per copy. Visitors are welcome. Project staff available for out-of-state awareness conferences (costs to be arranged). The HOSTS Corporation provides five-day training experiences at project or adopter site for certified and non-certified staff (costs to be negotiated).

contact Bill Gibbons, Executive Director; HOSTS Non-Profit Corporation; 5802 MacArthur Blvd.; Vancouver, WA 98661. (206) 694-1705 or 693-1775.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Titles I, II, and III USOE JDRP No. 75-6 Approved: 1/15/75

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT IMPROVEMENT OF BASIC READING SKILLS

descriptors Diagnostic Teaching, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Elementary Education, Individualized Instruction, Learning Disabilities, Learning Laboratories, Parent Participation, Remedial Reading Programs, Resource Room Programs, Self Concept, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for pupils in grades 1-8 who are reading below grade level.

description *Reading centers providing an individualized approach to remedial reading for educationally deprived children.*

Reading centers established in participating schools are staffed by a reading teacher and an aide who work with 10-12 children per period every day for the regular school term. Diagnostic tests are administered to determine specific needs of individual children. A "Need Sheet" is prepared for each child, providing a written prescription to help mastering basic reading skills and to reinforce classroom learning. A "Weekly Plan" sheet is maintained for each class, listing plans for each child. Correlation with regular classroom activity is stressed. Teacher's aides and parents are assigned to work with children needing additional help over and above that received in the classroom and reading center. Parent participation, through volunteer work and workshops, is a significant aspect of the project. Individualized attention shows the pupil that he/she is important and can excel in some way, reinforcing the primary goal of the project: to meet individual needs of students and help them achieve their potential.

Materials used include the Hoffman Reading Program supplemented by numerous other commercially available and teacher-made materials.

Students are selected for the program on the basis of scores from standardized tests (below 50th percentile), scores from diagnostic tests, cumulative record cards, teacher opinions, posttest scores of previous Title I students, and learning disabilities.

(This project has been described in a Project Information Package.)

evidence of effectiveness Pre/post Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test scores were submitted to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel in 1973-74. The average gain for students, grades 1-8, was 1.6. Evaluation results since 1973-74 show consistently significant gains. Data available upon request.

implementation requirements At least one well-equipped space per school for a reading center, with one teacher and aide per center. Training sessions are available. Detailed information upon request. A revised Project Information Package is available for examination and for sale to adopters. The PIP materials include orientation materials, management calendar, management directory, teacher's manual, staff development manual, and evaluator's manual.

financial requirements At the original site, per-pupil costs totaled $331.77; this figure includes administrative and instructional personnel, materials and equipment, and continuing inservice training. This figure is a continuing cost based on 467 students. Specific start-up costs are available upon request.

services available No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

Awareness materials are available free of charge upon request. Visitors are welcome by appointment. Training may be conducted at the project site or, when necessary and feasible, at the adopter site. Project staff can attend out-of-state conferences and awareness sessions (costs to be negotiated).

contact Elizabeth Dickson, or Edward M. Dodd; Improvement of Basic Reading Skills; Sylacauga City Schools; P.O. Drawer B; Sylacauga, AL 35150. (205) 245-5345 or 249-0393.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 74-109 Approved 10/18/74

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT IMPROVING ACHIEVEMENT (READING) THROUGH USE OF TEACHERS AND TEACHER AIDES

descriptors Basic Skills, Diagnostic Teaching, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Individualized Instruction, Remedial Reading Programs, Secondary Education, Tutorial Programs, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for students, grades 10-12, reading two or more years below grade level with low or failing grades in English classes. It has been used in other settings with grades 7-9, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description *A personalized and concentrated reading improvement program for secondary students.*

This project treats the problem of reading deficiency in secondary students through personalized and concentrated interaction: personalized in that the adult/student ratio is most often one-to-one; concentrated in that instruction occurs daily, one period per day. Each student's reading skills are thoroughly analyzed during the first few weeks. Instruction and rebuilding of attitude begin on a personalized basis at the point of identified deficiency (in many cases at point zero in the reading process). Individual records of areas of weakness and patterns of improvement are maintained. The importance of personal interest and positive reinforcement from the adult aide cannot be overemphasized. Reading instruction develops within the context of the total language arts curriculum. The project teacher and a team of eight aides supplement the regular teacher's instruction.

evidence of effectiveness Project evaluation was based on successful accomplishment of stated behavioral objectives. Pre- and posttesting used the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. Grade equivalent scores were reduced to average monthly gains. Eighty-five percent of participating students (rural low- to middle-income) measured an average monthly gain of 1.1 months or more per month.

implementation requirements All instructional management materials used are commercially available. No particular products or systems are stressed. An eclectic approach is used to prescribe materials as needed.

financial requirements Start-up costs run $200-$225 per student (based on 180 students at 1975 prices). These figures include the cost of hiring one project teacher and eight adult aides, as well as the cost of materials, equipment, and inservice. Per-student yearly costs remain relatively constant allowing for inflationary increases.

services available No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

Awareness materials are available. Visitors are welcome by appointment. No training is conducted at the project site. Training may be conducted out of state (exemplary project staff costs must be paid). Project staff can attend out-of-state conferences (expenses must be paid).

contact Leon West, Director; Sky View High School Project; Cache County School District; 2063 North 12th East; Logan, UT 84321. (801) 752-3925.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 74-110 Approved: 2/25/75

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT INTENSIVE READING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (IRIP)

descriptors Elementary Education, Inservice Teacher Education, Language Arts, Reading Instruction, Staff Improvement, Teaching Methods, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for elementary school teachers serving children in grades K-8.

description *A program for staff development of elementary school teachers intended to upgrade reading teaching skills.*

IRIP aims to raise elementary school reading achievement by upgrading teacher skills in reading instruction. One teacher from each participating school serves as a reading resource teacher. IRIP provides this teacher with 60 hours of training in essential theories and methods of teaching reading. The reading resource teacher then returns to school to conduct 30 hours of inservice training sessions for the school's other classroom teachers. Staffing includes a citywide coordinator, a district coordinator, school reading resource teachers, and classroom teachers.

Currently, 21 teacher-training units written especially for IRIP are used in the 60-hour preservice for reading resource teachers and the 30-hour inservice for classroom teachers. These units are: Self-Assessment, Test Data Interpretation, Continuous Progress-Mastery Learning Program, Grouping for Instruction, Directed Reading Lesson, Word Attack (Sight Vocabulary), Word Attack (Phonics), Word Attack (Structural Analysis), Comprehension (Vocabulary Development), Comprehension (Literal), Comprehension (Interpretation), Comprehension (Critical Reading), Study Skills (Parts One and Two), Literature Program, Oral Reading Development, Content Area Reading, Audio-Visual Resources, Teaching Reading to Speakers of Non-Standard English, Reading and the Non-English Speaker, and Home-School Partnership.

(Cited by the National Right to Read Effort as one of 13 exemplary reading programs.)

evidence of effectiveness An Inventory of Teacher Knowledge of Reading was administered to participating teachers. Pre- and posttesting with a norm-referenced test was used to measure student performance. The project was validated over a four-year period in 207 sites. Approximately 7,000 teachers and 250,000 learners were involved.

implementation requirements IRIP can be implemented in schools of any size having any organization pattern (K-8, K-3, K-4, 6-8, 7-8) or any instructional philosophy (graded/nongraded/individually guided). Involvement of total staff (administrative, teaching, paraprofessional) is recommended; however, IRIP can be implemented in phases (primary/intermediate/upper teachers).

financial requirements Cost depends on the number of reading resource teachers freed from classroom responsibilities to conduct inservice training and on the type of reproduction used for teacher-training units.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no charge. Visitors are welcome at project site by appointment. Project staff are available to attend out-of-state awareness meetings (costs to be negotiated). Training is provided at project site (adopter pays only its own costs). Training is also conducted at adopter sited (costs to be negotiated).

contact Carita A. Chapman, Director; Bureau of Reading Improvement; Chicago Board of Education, Room 849, 228 N. LaSalle St., Chicago, IL 60601. (312) 641-4059.

Developmental Funding: Chicago Board of Education USOE JDRP No. 74-27 Approved: 4/29/74

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT LEARNING TO READ BY READING

descriptors Disadvantaged Youth, Elementary Secondary Education, Individualized Instruction, Instructional Aids, Phonics, Reading Material, Remedial Reading Programs, Sequential Reading Programs, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for students from upper-elementary through adult levels with potential for reading and/or reading improvement.

description *A unique method of teaching reading to sub-par achievers at upper-elementary through junior college levels who have failed to progress with the use of conventional methods and materials, especially useful in alternative schools.*

A multimedia system for teaching reading especially applicable to students reading below 3.0 Grade Placement Level (GPL), including non-readers, and effective through 6.0 GPL. Reading With Symbols (cued reading using familiar objects to represent sounds) begins at primary level and progresses through an approximate tenth-grade reading level; it represents a new approach to phonetic and sight-word vocabulary development. Students (usually in groups of three) read orally to a teacher or aide an approximate 700 pages of cued stories. The system also incorporates "read-along" materials (radio plays, short stories, and captioned filmstrips), to be used either in conjunction with upper-level Reading With Symbols materials or alone for students at higher reading levels (GPL 3 and 5-8). Symbols representing 34 basic sounds are learned through use of a workbook. (Instruction on an individual or small-group basis is recommended.) Students learn symbol-sound relationships in less than one week. Thereafter, they read orally daily until they have progressed through the set of 16 cued readers. After completion of the first six books (2.0 to 4.5 reading level), the identical stories are read in the uncued version. This cued reading provides a bridge to regular reading and an opportunity to teach the more significant conventional rules of phonics, and furnishes an opportunity for assessment of reading progress. Read-along materials (24 half-hour short-story segments and nine one-hour radio plays) are used at a higher level of the program. Instruction in preparing this type of material as well as read-along captioned filmstrips is provided in the teacher training program.

(Cited by the National Right to Read Effort as one of 13 exemplary reading programs.)

evidence of effectiveness On Gates-MacGinitie, best project group made gain of 2.2 years in 12 weeks' time (one half day school). Some students at 4.0 made four or five grades' gain using "read-alongs" exclusively.

implementation requirements Adopting schools should plan for at least one long day or two short days of training. Aides of some sort should be provided. Normal classroom facilities are sufficient, but listening stations equipped with cassette recorders and head sets must be available for read-along phase. Adopters may use only Reading With Symbols, only read-alongs, or both. Program is applicable to remedial groups within a conventional classroom or to specially equipped remedial classes. Single-student tutoring is a viable possibility.

financial requirements Beginning set of eight Reading With Symbols (R/W/S) readers and teacher's manual free. Set of eight supplementary R/W/S readers (400 pages), $80; set of two uncued readers (400 pages), $20; flashcards, $5; set of 34 rubber symbols stamps, $50; read-along radio plays on cassette with script (16 available), $10 each; read-along short stories on cassette with script (22 available), $7.50 each; six longer tapes, $10 each. Full program based upon 20 students, $900.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no charge. Personnel are available for awareness and training sessions (expenses to be negotiated). On-site visitations (by appointment) and/or training at the project site are available.

contact Philip K. Glossa, Director; 18 N. Banner Dr.; Sonora, CA 95370. (209) 532-3556. Orval S. Hillman, Director; Reading Learning Center; P.O. Box 497; Jamestown, CA 95327. (209) 984-5741.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 74-37 Approved: 4/29/74

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT MATH LABORATORIES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

descriptors Basic Skills, Consultants, Concept Formation, Individualized Instruction, Instructional Aids, Intermediate Grades, Junior High Schools, Learning Activities, Learning Laboratories, Low Achievers, Mathematics Instruction, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for students, grades 5-8, scoring below the 40th percentile on the math subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test. Special students were excluded.

description *A laboratory approach to teaching basic mathematical skills to underachievers.*

Two mathematics laboratories were established in the project. Each laboratory teacher had five classes of 25 students each. The students were participants in the regular curriculum. Each teacher was assisted by one aide. The laboratories were regular classrooms that had been painted attractively and equipped with a calculator, a cassette tape recorder, commercial mathematics kits, and tables and chairs. Each student spent one hour per day, five days per week, in the math lab. The curriculum was designed for individualized study. The lab utilized five techniques: math lab activities, games and puzzles, drill and practice, individual instruction, and small-group instruction. Each student had a specific schedule that he/she followed.

The laboratories employed the following ten-point methodology: Each student progresses at his/her own rate. There is always a variety of activities available in each laboratory. Many suitable materials are purchased and developed and are readily available for student use. Much individual attention is given to each student. Math concepts are developed by manipulation of objects. The math lab activities are success-oriented and failure is kept to a minimum. Teachers study the habits of students in order to properly motivate them. Planning time is provided for the teacher and aide; it is considered vital. Inservice training plays a vital role. The project consultant works in the classroom with teachers and aides.

evidence of effectiveness Based on Stanford Achievement Test data, students in grades 7-8 gained a mean 1.31 years, exceeding the expected gain by more than five months. For pupils in grades 5-6, the mean achievement was 1.88 years, exceeding the goal by more than one year. Gains in attendance were also statistically significant. The achievement data of the treatment group were statistically compared to the achievement data of a control group.

implementation requirements Two weeks of preservice training and curriculum-materials development prior to the beginning of the school year are required. Monthly inservice activities are necessary for purposes of coordination and development and revision of the instructional materials and math games. One teacher and one aide are required for every 125 students; they teach five classes of 25 students. Two days of training are required -- one in addition to the Awareness Conference. Each teacher needs one set of materials at $10 per set.

financial requirements The start-up cost is approximately $50 per pupil, based on 250 participants. This includes all equipment and supplies and inservice expenses. Continuation cost is approximately $10 per pupil. This includes inservice expenses, replacement of consumable supplies, and the purchase of new items as needed. Salaries of teacher's aides are not included in the computation of these figures.

services available No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

Awareness materials are available. Visitors are welcome by appointment. Training is conducted at the project site (adopting site must cover all trainer costs as well as covering its own costs). Training may be conducted out of state (exemplary project staff costs must be paid). Project staff can attend out-of-state conferences (expenses must be paid).

contact David Johnson, Assistant Superintendent; Anderson County School District Two; Route 2; Honea Path, SC 29654. (803) 369-7364.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 76-88 Approved: 7/13/76

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT MATTESON FOUR-DIMENSIONAL READING PROGRAM

descriptors Basic Reading, Behavioral Objectives, Criterion Referenced Tests, Elementary Education, Individualized Instruction, Literature, Performance Based Education, Reading Instruction, Reading Interests, Reading Skills, Sequential Reading Programs, Skill Development, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for students of all abilities, grades 4-8.

description *A multitext, individualized, comprehensive reading skills-developmental reading program for grades 4-8.*

The program's goal is that students reach a level in the reading-skills sequence commensurate with their reading expectancy level. The four dimensions are: developing basic skills that students need in order to read critically, purposefully, and appreciatively; teaching students to use reading as a tool for learning; fostering an appreciation of literature; and developing permanent interests in reading for enjoyment. Students progress through a series of individualized learning packages covering 108 behavioral objectives, omitting the skills they have already mastered. Activities noted in the learning packages direct the student to selections in various reading texts appropriate to his/her independent reading level. Activities are varied and increase in level of readability and complexity following Bloom's Taxonomy. Criterion-referenced tests provide teacher and student with specific knowledge of skills the student has learned, as well as the skills appropriate for instruction. Criterion-referenced tests consist of: placement test, pretest, posttests, and sub-skills tests for all 108 objectives. A management system, consisting of class record sheets and individual pupil-progress charts, shows the student's growth in reading.

This skills-development portion of the program is expected to take from 40-60% of the total reading time. The remainder of the time is devoted to application of skills through a variety of reading-language activities to provide a well-integrated reading program.

Adopters are trained in the use of cloze procedure, readability formulas, application of behavioral objectives, writing learning packages, diagnosis and placement of students, and program operation.

(The Matteson Program is intended to be a basic skills-development reading program. It is not a supplement to a basal reader series.)

evidence of effectiveness After three years in the program, 80% of the project group met or exceeded their reading expectancy level (as determined by a modification of the Bond-Tinker formula), while only 41% in the control group met this criterion. The program group exceeded the control group by .63 on the Stanford Reading Achievement Test. Attitude toward reading was significantly higher in the program group, based on project-developed test.

implementation requirements Most likely adoption is a building unit, but program can be implemented in single classroom. No additional staffing is required. One or two staff from adopter district can be trained in two days; they, in turn, will train teachers of adopter. Project-developed set of Learning Cards and Mastery Tests are required materials along with one to three copies each of approximately 60 basal readers. These materials will accommodate a minimum of one classroom or a maximum of eight, depending on school organization. A small shelving unit for the texts and file containers for learning cards and tests are needed.

financial requirements A set of project-developed and commercial reading texts costs no more than $650, and will accommodate up to 150 students, depending upon school organization. Annual maintenance is minimal, requiring only replacement of worn books. Project materials alone cost: $35 for set of Learning Packages, $15 for set of Mastery Tests, and $3 for Guide. One set of record sheets, placement test, and other materials for duplication are provided free with purchase of these materials.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no charge. Visitors are welcome by appointment. Awareness and training sessions are available on- or off-site by arrangement. Materials are for sale through project.

contact Allan Dornseif, or Martha Carr; Matteson School District 162; 21244 Illinois St.; Matteson, IL 60443. (312) 748-0100.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 77-109 Approved: 2/25/77

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT THE NEW JERSEY WRITING PROJECT

descriptors

Inservice Teacher Education, Language Arts, Program Evaluation, Secondary Education, Staff Improvement, Validated Programs, Writing

target audience

Approved by JDRP for teachers and students, grades 7-12, all ability levels.

description

A teacher-training program that improves student writing.

The New Jersey Writing Project is a state-wide writing program based on a thorough knowledge of the composing process. This project is predicated on the following assumptions: writing is a process and a mode of learning; teachers of writing should write; teachers teaching teachers accomplish efficient curriculum change; theory about and assessment of writing should enhance classroom practices.

The program involves three stages: teacher training, implementation and staff development, and assessment. The teacher training stage is a three-week summer institute for teachers from multiple districts in the same geographic region. Each day of the training program is divided into a writing/sharing morning session and a theory presentation in the afternoon. The second stage is a two-part program. First, returning teacher consultants introduce writing as a process into their classrooms. Within the confines of the regular English period each teacher provides time for students to write in class. All students are instructed in the process of effective editorial feedback. Teachers do not have to edit each student's paper because students do that for themselves and for others. Second, in addition to implementation in the classroom the returning teachers begin staff development programs suited to the unique needs of district curricula. The third stage involves the development and use of assessment instruments and procedures. This evaluative phase encompasses the following components: students' writing samples; training for teachers in holistic scoring; and teacher and student writing attitude surveys.

evidence of effectiveness

Writing samples obtained in October and May from 1,400 students in eight treatment districts and seven control districts representing urban, suburban, and rural New Jersey were scored using a holistic method developed by Educational Testing Service. Regression analysis, adjusting posttest scores for pretest scores, indicating that the difference between treatment and control groups was highly significant ($p \leq .001$), amounting to 45.5% of the standard deviation of the posttest distribution.

implementation requirements

The program should be adopted by a group of districts wishing to work jointly on student writing. Training is required. One or two district teachers receive intensive training and return to their schools to train others.

financial requirements

Costs are limited to training. Training for a group of 25 teachers from 10-20 districts at adopter site: a trainer for three weeks, $1,500; travel and residency for the trainer, if required, $1000; payment or credits for participating teachers as per local option; paper and supplies, $300.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstator project.

Awareness materials are available at no cost. Visitors are welcome at project site and additional demonstration sites in home state by appointment. Project staff are available to attend out-of-state awareness meetings (costs to be negotiated). Training is limited to groups of 10 adopting districts from the same geographical area. Project funding allows three groups to be trained at no cost. Project can provide trainers at cost to other groups.

contact Linda Waitkus, Project Director; South Brunswick Township Public School; 1 Executive Dr.; Monmouth Junction, NJ 08852. (201) 297-7800.

Developmental Funding: National Endowment for the Humanities USOE JDRP No. 79-19 Approved: 5/23/79

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT PEGASUS: Personalized Educational Growth and Achievement with Selective Utilization of Staff

adoption site of PEGASUS-PACE: Personalized Educational Growth And Selective Utilization of Staff -- Personalized Approach to Continuous Education; Tuscaloosa, Alabama

descriptors Behavioral Objectives, Diagnostic Teaching, Diagnostic Tests, Elementary Secondary Education, Individualized Instruction, Instructional Materials, Motivation Techniques, Reading Instruction, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for grades 2-9. This program has been used in other settings with grades 10-12, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description *A management program in reading personalized to meet students' needs.*

The PEGASUS curriculum structure consists of performance objectives and corresponding diagnostic instruments on 17 sequential reading levels at all ability levels in grades K-8. Students in grades 9-12 use PEGASUS as a specialized program.

After diagnosis, students are grouped and sub-grouped according to established needs. A chart is used to track each student's progress.

A resource file of learning materials for fast, average, and slower achieving students is coded to the PEGASUS objectives. Additional learning activities are developed, coded, and shared by PEGASUS adopters in inservice sessions.

Instruction is personalized, motivation techniques are emphasized, and a variety of approaches to teach reading skills is used. No single teaching approach is either recommended or required. Teachers continue to use any methods they have found successful. PEGASUS utilizes materials found in adopter's classrooms.

The program is offered for diagnosing student needs, selecting appropriate materials to meet those needs, and assessing student gains. PEGASUS aids classroom teachers in organizing instruction for reading and other subject areas.

evidence of effectiveness Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests were given in October and May 1976-77 and 1977-78 to a random group of students, grades 2-9, in PEGASUS schools and control schools. Students were selected from several districts, rural and urban, that had similar socioeconomic characteristics. At all grades, students in PEGASUS schools showed greater gain than those in control schools.

implementation requirements The program may be implemented by classroom teachers as well as by special reading teachers. Two days of inservice training and personalized follow-up are offered to each adopting school. Although some specialized support is needed, such help can be provided by curriculum-oriented principals, supervisors, or key teachers already employed. No additional staffing is necessary. No special equipment is needed. PEGASUS can be adapted to any organizational arrangement of classes. PEGASUS may be adopted by one teacher, a group of teachers, or all teachers in a building or school district. Teachers should be involved in the decision to adopt.

financial requirements PEGASUS Master Volume (Teachers' Guide and Key; Objectives and Skills Check Sheets; Diagnostic Instruments R-16; Separate Answer Sheets for Diagnostic Instruments 9-16), $40. Reproduction costs, 50¢-$1 per student per year. Inservice Packets, $17. Resource file folders and labels, $33. Optional start-up materials for resource file, $40. A wide variety of commercially available materials already found in most classrooms is used.

services available No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

Awareness materials are available at no charge. Project staff can attend out-of-state awareness meetings (costs to be arranged). Two days of inservice training and personalized follow-up are available at demonstration or adopter site (costs to be arranged).

contact Cheryl Hendress, Project Coordinator; Bureau County Educational Service Region; Courthouse; Princeton, IL 61356. (815) 875-1529 or 872-4181.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Titles III and IV-C USOE JDRP No. 1 Approved: 1/9/79

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT PRE-ALGEBRA DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

descriptors Basic Skills, Calculation, Concept Formation, Diagnostic Teaching, Mathematics Instruction, Remedial Instruction, Secondary Education, Teaching Methods, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for regular mathematics classes at the seventh- and eighth-grade level, eight-week summer mathematics programs for students entering high school, and remedial mathematics programs at the high school level.

description *A basic conceptual/computational skills program in mathematics designed to serve the dual purpose of preparing students for algebra as they develop proficiencies in the basic skills.*

The curriculum design develops students' basic computational and conceptual skills through five units of concentration: Ratios and Proportions, Fractions, Decimals, Percent, and Metric Measures.

Mathematics principles used in the development of all curriculum materials include Ratios and Proportions, One -- Its Name and Properties, Place Value, and the Additive and Subtractive Properties of Numbers. These tools of the trade provide a foundation for the teaching of concepts. The program uses an original instructional approach that complements the diversified learning behavior of individuals,

The instructional technique employs mathematics laboratory instruction, regular classroom instruction, and individualized diagnosis and remediation, coupled with reading in mathematics, to improve computational skills.

evidence of effectiveness Evaluation studies showed that approximately 80% of project students scored an average gain of two grade levels (Stanford Achievement Test) and were subsequently enrolled in algebra, 92% passed algebra with a high degree of success, 85% took additional mathematics courses beyond algebra, and 15% took four years of high school mathematics.

implementation requirements School districts having a student population that includes at least one class of graduating eighth graders unprepared for regular high school algebra, wanting to use Pre-Algebra techniques and concepts to build sound understanding for basic mathematics concepts in junior high school students, and/or offering remedial mathematics classes at the high school level should consider adopting a Pre-Algebra program. A mutual adoption agreement must be signed by the D/D and the adopter before beginning adoption.

financial requirements Adoption costs depend on the number of students to be taught, teachers to be trained, and attendance centers involved. Text materials: $5 per student. Laboratory materials: approximately $600 (may be used by as many as 500 students with staggered schedules).

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no cost. Visitors are welcome at project site by appointment. Project staff are available to attend out-of-state awareness meetings. Training is provided at project site (adopter pays only its own costs). Training is also conducted at adopter sites.

contact Dorothy Strong; Pre-Algebra Development Centers; 228 N. LaSalle St., Room 817; Chicago, IL 60621. (312) 641-4062.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 75-33 Approved: 5/13/75

Completed Summer 1979

PROJECT THE PROCESS OF TEACHING BASIC READING SKILLS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

descriptors

Class Management, Inservice Teacher Education, Reading Improvement, Secondary Education, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by JDRP for teachers in secondary schools, grades 7-12, and apprentices from teacher centers, regional educational labs, and state departments of education. Developed for use by teachers of students needing basic reading skills, it can also be used by teachers, program developers, and administrators, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description

A program providing inservice workshops to help secondary teachers manage class time and student behavior in basic reading classes.

Research findings gathered from secondary classrooms where basic reading was being taught were used to identify processes specifically related to reading gain. Positively related processes were found to include: discussion of homework or the reading content; instruction in new work; drill and practice; reading aloud by students; instruction focused on a small group or the total group; praise and support; positive corrective feedback provided by rephrasing the question or probing; and short quizzes. Negatively related processes include: teacher time spent on organizational or management tasks; outside intrusions (loudspeakers, and so forth); social interactions; misbehavior or negative interactions; too much choice for students; too much time spent on written assignments; too much silent reading; and too much time spent with single students.

Based on these findings, the project developed seven 2-1/2 hour teacher workshops. The first presents an overview of the research findings, which are interpreted for their relevance to teaching basic reading skills. In the second workshop, teachers are given individual profiles, prepared from observations conducted in their classrooms, together with recommendations for changes in their teaching behavior. The third workshop provides recommendations for student motivation and behavior management. The fourth workshop is focused on ways of organizing or structuring classroom activities and on efficient management of time. The fifth workshop deals with question-asking techniques and with supportive and corrective feedback; diagnostic tests for use by classroom teachers and appropriate reading materials are also shared. At semester's end, teacher observations are conducted to determine whether recommendations have been followed. New profiles are prepared so that changes in teacher behavior may be examined at the sixth and seventh workshops, which follow. Recommendations are given to each teacher. Workshop sessions are conducted one week apart, generally between 3:30 and 6:00 PM. Groups are limited to six. Although materials are used in the workshops, the cornerstone of the process is the encouragement and support given to teachers to try new ideas. Every teacher operates in a unique situation, and class size, room assignment, and school policies will determine how he or she can respond to recommendations.

evidence of effectiveness

Remedial reading students of teachers receiving the training gained 50.4 standard score points on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, equivalent to 1.8 years' gain. Teachers in the treatment group changed their classroom instructional processes in the ways recommended.

implementation requirements

Teachers attend seven 2-1/2 hour workshops, held after school hours. They are observed in the fall, winter, and spring. They are given recommendations for behavior change based on these observations. They are expected to try to make the recommended changes. Apprentices are expected to observe and participate in workshop sessions; they also learn to conduct observations. Subsequently, apprentices conduct workshops and train observers and other apprentices at their own sites.

financial requirements

Costs vary with the number of teachers, observers, and apprentices trained. Costs of training at the project site include project staff time and adopter staff time, per diem, and travel.

services available

No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

Project staff are available to attend out-of-state awareness conferences (expenses must be paid). Training is conducted at the project site (adopter pays its own costs). Training is also conducted at the adopter's site (exemplary staff costs must be paid).

contact Jane Stallings, or Margaret Needels; SRI International; 333 Ravenswood Ave.; Menlo Park, CA 94025. (415) 326-6200, ext. 3564.

Developmental Funding: National Institute of Education, State and Local

USOE JDRP No. 79-41 Approved 12/19/79

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT PROJECT R-3: Readiness, Relevancy and Reinforcement

descriptors Career Education, Cooperative Planning, Decision Making Skills, Diagnostic Teaching, Educational Games, Individualized Instruction, Junior High Schools, Mathematics Instruction, Motivation Techniques, Reading Instruction, Simulation, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for students of all abilities, grades 7-9. It has also been used with elementary, high school, and alternative school audiences, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description *A motivational basic skills program that interrelates the reading and mathematics curricula through gaming/simulation activities involving career awareness.*

Project R-3 was jointly designed in 1967 by the San Jose Unified School District and the Education Systems Organization of Lockheed Missiles and Space Company with the help of consultants from San Jose State University. Its curriculum interrelates reading and mathematics and supplies reinforcement through gaming/simulation, intensive involvement (a three-day study trip), parental involvement, and an inservice training program for staff development. The main objective of Project R-3 is the upgrading of essential reading and mathematics skills. By deeply involving the students in classroom games and simulations, the program seeks to motivate them to achieve in learning experiences: to make them ready to learn, to make learning relevant, and to reinforce positive attitudes and behavior.

The project utilizes the diagnostic/prescriptive individualized approach in reading and math. Reinforcement of skill areas is provided through gaming/simulation activities that involve team learning, the decision-making process, and developing career awareness.

(This project has been described in a Project Information Package.)

evidence of effectiveness The overall reading achievement gain for 1972-73 on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) Form R Level 3 exceeded normal expectations by three months. Per-month average gains were 1.4. The overall mathematics achievement gain for 1972-73 on CTBS was two years for eight months in the program. Highest gains were in Computation and Concepts (2.3 and 1.9). Lowest gain was in Math Application (1.3). An outside evaluator is contracted for both product and process evaluation.

implementation requirements Reading and mathematics teachers should have a knowledge of the diagnostic/prescriptive approach to individualized instruction. Teachers must be receptive to team planning. All staff should develop expertise in gaming/simulation. Approximately 50 hours of inservice work are accomplished by each staff member in a given year.

financial requirements The basic materials of a secondary-level reading program can be utilized. Special prepared math contracts cost approximately $150 for a complete set of masters which can be duplicated. Other costs: reproduction of gaming/simulation activities and contracts; secondary instructional aides.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no charge. Visitors are welcome by appointment at project and demonstration sites. Training is conducted at the project site (adapter pays only its own costs). Training can be conducted out of state (exemplary project staff costs may be paid). Project staff are available for awareness, in-depth workshops, training, and technical assistance.

contact Pauline E. Perazzo; 1635 Park Ave.; San Jose, CA 95126. (408) 287-1111 or -1112.

Developmental Funding: Variety of State and Federal Sources USOE JDRP No. 74-13 Approved: 2/20/74

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT READING/ENGLISH ROTATION PROJECT

descriptors Basic Skills, Class Organization, Communication Skills, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, English, Junior High Schools, Language Experience Approach, Reading Instruction, Teaching Methods, Team Teaching, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for grades 6-9.

description *A rotating classroom approach to teaching reading skills to students, grades 6-9. Not a "pull-out" model.*

An organizational pattern was designed to take into account the characteristics of the students and to identify and meet their individual needs. Students are divided into small, flexible groups of six to ten, which move from station to station. Different materials and activities at each station are specifically planned to build a success pattern for the individual child. A rotation group consists of 60 children. Each group of 20 moves to three different classrooms during a two-period time block of one hour and 50 minutes. One classroom is equipped as a reading laboratory where basic reading skills are emphasized. A second classroom reinforces reading skills through various reading activities selected to provide sequential development of skills. In the third classroom, the English teacher again reinforces the reading skills through various English/reading skill exercises and through the language-experience approach to reading. This is a team-teaching approach that emphasizes the integration of the basic communication skills, as opposed to the "pull-out" model.

evidence of effectiveness The mean gain for the 104 participants during FY 1972 was 1.3 years (Gates-MacGinitie). The average achievement prior to the project was 2.65 years in six years of schooling. Over a period of nine years participants have averaged one month's growth in reading per month of instruction as measured by standardized achievement tests.

implementation requirements Two state-paid teachers, one lead reading teacher (Title I), and four paraprofessionals (Title I) are required. This staffing equals one rotation and/or 60 students, which equals three classrooms. Materials already found in most schools are used.

financial requirements $15 per student, excluding personnel.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available. Visitors are welcome October through April by appointment. Regularly scheduled training programs are conducted at project site. Training is conducted out of state. Staff can attend out-of-state conferences.

contact Marcelyn Hobbs, Program Director; Reading/English Rotation Project; Norris School; McDuffie County Schools; Thomson, GA 30824. (404) 595-3527.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 35 Approved: 4/4-5/73

Compiled Summer 1979

36

PROJECT PROJECT READING IMPROVEMENT

descriptors Diagnostic Teaching, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Elementary Secondary Education, Individualized Instruction, Learning Activities, Learning Laboratories, Remedial Reading Programs, Teaching Methods, Tutoring, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for grades 2-8. It has also been used in grades 1 and 9-12, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description *A laboratory and tutorial project attacking the problem of reading deficiencies of children in grades 2-8.*

One-to-one instruction is provided by 13 tutors for first graders who are having the most difficulty. Reading improvement laboratory experiences are provided for eligible children, grades 2-8. Each of the 16 reading laboratories is staffed with a specially trained reading teacher and a paraprofessional assistant. Eleven are certified as reading teachers and two are working toward reading certification in addition to their elementary grades certification. Only children whose standardized reading test scores are well below norms established for their age levels are selected as participants. Children are drawn from the regular classroom for 45 minutes of laboratory instruction each day. Laboratory periods are scheduled so they do not conflict with the child's reading instruction in the regular classroom. Each lab consists of small groups of 10 or fewer so that much individual instruction may be given. The standard reading lab is divided into three parts: the first is usually small-group work in word analysis, the second is for reading specific material listed on a student's folder, while the third is for individual work designed to meet individual needs. Children's reading skills in 277 separate areas are diagnosed and prescriptive instruction is provided to correct deficiencies. Standardized diagnostic tests and informal reading inventories are administered to each child at intervals throughout the year. Primary emphasis is on comprehension, but vocabulary, speed, and accuracy are also stressed.

Efforts are made to use instructional techniques that differ from those of conventional classrooms, in order to capture and maintain the participants' interest and increase motivation. Project staff have learned that a principal cause of reading problems is lack of desire to learn to read. A variety of learning activities is provided to correct lack of interest problems.

(This project has been described in a Project Information Package.)

evidence of effectiveness Laboratory participants are pretested in September and posttested in April. The project objective is 1.5 years grade-equivalent gain for all participants during the seven months. The actual mean gain (average over a five-year period ending 1976-77) was 1.61 years or 2.3 months per month of instruction. Standard scores were also used for evaluation. For each grade level (2-8), gains exceeded one-third of a standard deviation mean gain for all participants. Mean normal curve equivalent gain for all children 1978-79 was 11.5 (Gates-MacGinitie tests).

implementation requirements Project requires a trained reading teacher and a paraprofessional assistant for every 50 students. Laboratories use teacher-made and commercial materials. Appropriate audio-visual materials are used as well. A cross-index system of materials designed to develop particular skills is maintained. High-interest, low-difficulty materials see extensive use. Instructional games and materials are used to stimulate genuine interest and total involvement. Project is suitable for Title I adoption.

financial requirements Set-up cost for equipment is approximately $1,000, less the value of appropriate audio-visual equipment already on hand. Set-up costs for materials total approximately $1,000 per 50 students. Upkeep material costs average approximately $200 per year for each lab (50 students).

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials available. Additional training materials available to potential adopters. Visitors welcome by appointment. Training available to adopter at developer site and adopter site. Developer costs funded with NDN Developer/Demonstrator funds (including follow-up activities). Project staff may attend limited number of awareness conferences.

contact W. C. Blackmore, ESEA Title I Director, or Thelma D. McDuffie, Dissemination Coordinator; P.O. Box 1239; Burgaw, NC 28425. (919) 259-2187.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 74-103 Approved: 10/18/74

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT READING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM -- SECONDARY SCHOOLS READING LABORATORY

descriptors Diagnostic Teaching, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Individualized Instruction, Learning Laboratories, Reading Skills, Remedial Reading Programs, Secondary Education, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for junior and senior high school students reading one year or more below grade level.

description *An individualized reading skills program.*

Through preservice training, the reading consultant and the Wood County reading supervisor provide models and suggestions for the organization and management of reading laboratories. Each lab is staffed with a teacher and an aide who work with 60 students daily in groups of 12 for 50-minute sessions. Each student's reading deficiency is diagnosed, and a reading-skill improvement program is developed for remediation of the deficiency. The management system devised for the operation of each laboratory gives the students independence and responsibility. Approximately 90 percent of each student's laboratory experience is used for individualized instruction.

The Reading Improvement Program currently serves economically and educationally disadvantaged secondary students in five eligible Wood County junior high schools, two eligible Wood County senior high schools, and one parochial junior-senior high school.

evidence of effectiveness Individualized prescriptions were written, and weekly evaluations conducted. Continuous progress assessments were made to assure that all students experienced success. Standardized test evaluation (Stanford Reading Achievement Test) indicated that participating students showed statistically significant gains between pre- and posttesting period.

implementation requirements No special facilities or staff are required. It is anticipated that ongoing maintenance will consist primarily of instructional salaries, with a minimal amount expended for purchase of equipment, materials, and contractual service for equipment maintenance.

financial requirements When the Reading Improvement Program was initiated, the materials purchased focused on five basic areas of reading: auditory and visual perception, vocabulary, word-attack skills, comprehension, and motivational materials. Tapes, films, filmstrips, records, and many high-interest, low-vocabulary books were utilized. The initial cost averaged $373.87 per pupil.

services available No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

Awareness materials are available. Visitors are welcome anytime. Training is conducted at the project site (adopting site must cover all trainer costs as well as own costs). Training is also conducted out of state (exemplary project staff costs must be paid). Project staff can attend out-of-state conferences (expenses must be partially subsidized).

contact Darel K. Custer, Director; Title I; Wood County Schools; 1210 Thirteenth St.; Parkersburg, WV 26101. (304) 422-8411.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 76-84 Approved: 7/1/76

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT

READING -- INDIVIDUALIZED REMEDIAL LABORATORIES
MATH -- INDIVIDUALIZED REMEDIATION

descriptors

Basic Skills, Diagnostic Teaching, Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Elementary Secondary Education, Individualized Instruction, Learning Laboratories, Mathematics Instruction, Remedial Instruction, Remedial Reading Programs, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by JDRP as a reading program for children ages 6-18. It has been used in other settings as a mathematics program, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description

A project designed to provide continuous diagnosis of student needs and daily prescriptions for learning improvement.

The reading laboratories have been developed for high concentration on the improvement of basic reading skills. A reading laboratory staffed by one special reading teacher and a paraprofessional accommodates 80-120 students daily for the entire school year. Each student's daily prescription includes two or more activities designed to meet his/her needs. Students' prescriptions include programmed and self-instructional materials purchased from a variety of vendors, or developed by both consultants and project teachers. Emphasis is placed on inservice education, focusing on cognitive reading skills and on the management and use of individualized instruction in the classroom. Inservice education is provided through workshops, consultant classroom visits, and local supervisory services and support.

The mathematics program provides systematic remedial instruction in areas of individual student weaknesses. A teacher and a paraprofessional work with 80-120 students daily in a specially equipped classroom. The mathematics laboratories are characterized by a focus on carefully selected essential concepts, skills, and applications with number ideas and computation; an individualized approach to the instruction; a meaningful approach to the learning of content; careful monitoring of student achievement; and teacher guidance in a supportive atmosphere. The program is based on project-developed materials, reinforced by a variety of supplementary resources and activities. Daily work is guided by individual prescriptions consisting of two or three types of activities. Inservice education receives a strong emphasis through workshops, consultant visits, and local supervisory services and support. There is an ongoing evaluation of project content, materials, instructional procedures, and overall achievement pattern of students.

evidence of effectiveness

Data collected in 1977-78 following JDRP approval showed the following average gains over an eight-month period: Slosson Oral Reading Test, 1.28 years average gain; Gray Oral Test, 1.51 years average gain; California Reading Achievement Test, 1.15 years average gain; California Math Test, 1.11 years average gain. The individualized laboratory approach seems also to minimize student negative behavior through individual and positive reinforcement.

implementation requirements

An extra teacher and paraprofessional are required to serve up to 120 students. A classroom facility for use as a laboratory is needed. Normal furnishings (tables and chairs that can be arranged in a flexible manner) are suitable. A filing cabinet for student record folders is needed. It is desirable to have an audio-active card reader and three or four cassette player-recorders. Start-up training takes eight hours; continuing training takes a minimum of two hours per month, but six to eight hours are preferable.

financial requirements

Expenditures averaged approximately $229 per student. This figure includes all administrative and backup support services. (Project staff noted that past experience and thrust in the reading area made for easier organization and utilization of previous projects' materials, equipment, and staff.)

services available

No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

Awareness materials are available. Visitors are welcome by appointment. Training is conducted at the project site (adopting site must cover all trainer costs as well as own costs). Training is conducted out-of-state (exemplary project staff costs must be paid). Project staff can attend out-of-state conferences (coverage of expenses will depend on situation).

contact

Virginia Morgan; Reading Laboratories; Dougherty County School System; P.O. Box 1470; Albany, GA 31702. (912) 436-6544.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I

USOE JDRP No. 74-107 Approved: 10/18/74

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT RIGHT TO READ: Wilson Junior High School

descriptors

Content Reading, Cross Age Teaching, Interdisciplinary Approach, Needs Assessment, Reading Instruction, Secondary Education, Staff Improvement, Validated Programs, Volunteers

target audience

Approved by JDRP for pupils, grades 7 and 8. It has been used in other settings with pupils in middle and high school, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description

An effort to eliminate illiteracy and turn kids on to reading.

Right to Read differs from many previous attempts at solving reading problems. It is a process, not a program. It gets at causes, not symptoms. It requires commitment, not money.

Wilson Junior High School Right to Read is part of a national effort to eliminate illiteracy and turn kids on to reading. It requires that users perform a needs assessment to find out precisely what is needed. Planning is based on the needs assessment. Implementation of the plan involves professional development, with special emphasis on paid teacher writing time so that teachers can work together to bring about change. Through sharing, teachers can build upon each other's strengths and find quicker and better solutions to their problems.

The major thrust of the program is to encourage teachers to teach reading as it is related to their particular content area. Cross-age tutoring, community volunteers, and teacher assistants help increase reading efficiency at all levels of development. Students whose reading skills are particularly low attend special centers where they receive intensive individual attention.

Staff development -- taking the good teachers and making them into better teachers -- is emphasized.

(Cited by the National Right to Read Effort as one of 13 exemplary reading programs.)

evidence of effectiveness

Evaluation data (Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills) show that, over the six-month period between pre- and posttesting, the average growth in vocabulary was 11 months, or 1.8 months' growth for each month of instruction. In comprehension, the average growth was 18 months, or 3.0 months' growth for each month of instruction. The total reading score indicated that average growth was 14 months, or 2.3 months for each month of instruction.

implementation requirements

Adopter must be willing to reevaluate the cost effectiveness of current program. The Right to Read process gives direction to a school or system without sacrificing local autonomy. All financial decisions are made locally with respect to determined needs and priorities.

financial requirements

Right to Read Assessment and Planning Handbook (available from State Right to Read Directors) and state-adopted and other commercially prepared materials covering a range of reading abilities and student interests are used. Our own management system, with criterion-referenced objectives and teacher-developed tests, provides the basis for our diagnostic/prescriptive approach.

services available

No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

Awareness materials are available. Visitors are welcome by appointment. Project staff are available for awareness conferences only if all expenses, plus honorarium, are paid. Training is conducted at adopter site, and all expenses, plus honorarium, must be paid unless training can be scheduled for non-school time, on weekends or in summer.

contact Valerie G. Musso, Program Coordinator; Right to Read; Woodrow Wilson Junior High; 3838 Orange Ave.; San Diego, CA 92105. (714) 280-1661, ext. 22

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 74-21 Approved: 3/25/74

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT SEAPORT: Student Education Assuring Positive Organized Reading Techniques

descriptors

Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Elementary Education, Home Visits, Individualized Instruction, Junior High Schools, Parent Participation, Preschool Education, Remedial Reading Programs, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by the JDRP as a remedial reading program for students, grades 2-3 and 6-9, most in need and at least one year below the appropriate grade level. It has been used in other settings with grades 1, 4, and 5 and a home/school liaison program including a preschool program, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description

A program applying school-based and home/school liaison approaches to remedial reading problems.

Project SEAPORT is a remedial reading program which provides Title I students, grades 1-9, with individualized prescriptive instruction in the classroom setting and in a pull-out resource learning laboratory. Skilled reading specialists work with students who have been identified as most in need of remedial services. The program places a strong emphasis on reading activities within content areas.

Project success is enhanced by cooperation between reading specialists and classroom teachers. Specialists provide regular consultant services to classroom teachers. Staff development is a major component of the program. Inservice training is provided for reading specialists and classroom teachers.

Student progress is assessed each year, using pre- and posttest scores on standardized achievement tests. Quarterly monitoring and annual needs assessment are integral parts of the annual evaluation.

Project SEAPORT activities enjoy a high level of parent/community involvement. Involvement is enhanced by frequent parent-teacher conferences, a parent advisory council, frequent dissemination of information on project activities to the community, and an annual needs assessment. These activities are coordinated by a home/school liaison specialist.

Subsequent to receiving JDRP approval, Project SEAPORT instituted educational intervention for children prior to entering school. Pre-kindergarten youngsters identified by home/school liaison staff as having developmental deviations receive instruction and remediation in developmental skills.

(This project has been described in a Project Information Package.)

evidence of effectiveness

Data from testing of project elementary and junior high students in 1973 with the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test indicate an average grade-equivalent gain of 1.5 in vocabulary and 1.6 in comprehension. Project evaluation statistics for 1978 show an average NCE gain of 10 for grades 1-5 and 12 for grades 6-9.

implementation requirements

One remedial reading specialist is required for every 30-40 students. Reading specialists must work both in laboratory and classroom settings. Teachers must set aside time for weekly consultations with reading specialists. A resource room for use as a reading lab is necessary, and a variety of commercially available auditory and visual materials to stock it. A professional home/school liaison specialist is needed to implement the parent/community involvement component and to set up screening and programming for the preschool component. Start-up training for reading specialists and/or classroom teachers takes between two and three days, depending on components adopted.

financial requirements

Cost of implementation varies with site requirements. Costs include staffing (reading specialists and home/school liaison specialist) and training (released time, travel, and per diem for training workshop participants). Training manual for reading specialists, $20 (free to adopters). Management Manual, $50.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available free. On-site visits are encouraged. Training is conducted at project site or adopter site. Follow-up assistance is available for adopters.

contact Mary C. Macioci, Project Director, or Mary E. Kohring, Disseminator Facilitator; Project SEAPORT; Newport School Department Administration Center; Grant Programs Office; Newport, RI 02840. (401) 849-4588.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 29 Approved: 4/9/73

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT STAMM: Systematic Teaching And Measuring Mathematics

descriptors

Continuous Progress Plan, Criterion Referenced Tests, Curriculum, Educational Alternatives, Elementary Secondary Education, Instructional Materials, Mathematics Instruction, Secondary Education, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by JDRP for students of all abilities, grades K-8. It has been used in other settings with grades 9-12, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description

A complete mathematics curriculum for kindergarten through Algebra II-Trigonometry, including alternative high school courses.

The major objective of the program is to provide continuous progress in mathematics for the entire school experience of all students, kindergarten through senior high school. The STAMM program represents a complete system that can be adopted or adapted by other districts. A framework of objectives and assessment by criterion-referenced tests are basic to STAMM. Careful monitoring of student progress, measurement of mathematics competencies, and alternative courses at the high school level are featured. The program may be used successfully in many different classroom situations, including small-group instruction, large-group instruction, individualized instruction, team teaching, and math lab. Resource material is provided for each objective; textbooks, manipulative materials, and teacher-made resources may be incorporated as well.

Since STAMM is based on continuous progress, it is important for a school using STAMM to keep complete records on each student and to test each student's progress frequently. This enables a teacher, in the fall, to continue a student from where he/she left off in the spring. A teacher with one grade level of students may need to be familiar with more than one level of the program to accommodate continuous progress.

The basic skills continuum for grades K-8 is covered in levels A, B, C, D, E, F, GE, G, and H. High school courses are defined for Mathematics Competencies, Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, Trigonometry, Applied Math, Vocational Math, and Rapid Calculation.

Special materials are packaged for Title I and special education emphasis for use in regular classrooms and labs.

evidence of effectiveness

Between two-thirds and three-fourths of all Jefferson County students now score above the national norm on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills at grades 4, 6, and 8. This achievement has been consistent from 1973 through spring 1979. Prior to implementation, roughly half the students scored above the national norm.

implementation requirements

STAMM guides, tests, and workbooks may be used by a single teacher or an entire school system. The more levels involved in implementation, the greater the gains from the continuous-progress aspect of STAMM. A one- or two-day training session prior to implementation is recommended. Weekly or monthly meetings are recommended for the local staff. STAMM does not dictate teaching style, and may be used in any classroom setting. Textbooks may be used as an integral part of the program, but experience advises that they be supplemented with teacher-made or STAMM resource materials.

financial requirements

STAMM teachers' manuals, K-12, $10 each. Each teacher needs one manual for each level or course taught. Test books and workbooks: $3 each for single copies, $2.50 each for 11-100 copies, and $2.25 each for 101+ copies. Materials may be reproduced locally if quality printing facilities are available.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no charge. Awareness and training sessions are available at adopter site within funding and scheduling limitations. Training is also available at the developer site. Visitations may be scheduled with advance notice but are not a prerequisite for adoption. Training dates at the developer site for 1979-80 are scheduled for: October 15-16 and December 13-14, 1979; February 28-29, May 15-16, and July 10-11, 1980.

contact Glyn H. Sharpe, STAMM Project Director; Jefferson County Schools; 1209 Quail St.; Lakewood, CO 80215. (303) 231-2341.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 76-87 Approved: 6/23/76

PROJECT STUDENT TEAM LEARNING: Intergroup Relations

descriptors Basic Skills, Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), Educational Games, Elementary Secondary Education, Group Relations, Humanistic Education, Intergroup Relations, Peer Teaching, Social Integration, Teaching Methods, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP for students, grades 5-12. It is now used in grades 2-4, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description *A set of instructional techniques placing students in four- or five-member multi-ethnic learning teams to master basic skills.*

Student Team Learning (STL) consists of three major techniques: Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD), Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT), and Jigsaw. All three require students to work in learning teams that are heterogeneous in terms of sex, race, and past performance. In STAD, students study worksheets in their teams following a teacher presentation. Then they take quizzes individually to demonstrate how much they have learned. The students' quiz scores are summed to form a team score, which later is printed in a weekly newsletter. TGT is similar to STAD, except that students display their learning by playing academic games instead of taking quizzes. In Jigsaw, students become "experts" on topics relating to narrative material they have read and teach these topics to their teammates. STL is the umbrella term for these three programs. Two STL programs have JDRP approval of their own. STAD is approved for language arts and TGT for language arts and math. Any district that adopts STL also adopts STAD and TGT.

Student Team Learning can be used with the teacher's manual alone and teacher-made curriculum materials. Inexpensive materials in mathematics, language arts, and nutrition are available (see below). The techniques are very practical. They are in use in hundreds of schools across the U.S.

The effects of Student Team Learning on intergroup relations are strong and consistent because the team goal and team interactions allow students to view one another positively. There is no specific mention of race or ethnicity in the program. Because the program is inexpensive, takes no more class or teacher time than traditional methods, and increases achievement as well as improving intergroup relations, it can be used as a regular part of class instruction in any subject.

(Student Team Learning: Intergroup Relations, Teams-Games-Tournament [TGT], and Student Teams-Achievement Divisions [STAD]: Language Arts, all described in this catalog, are affiliate projects of Student Team Learning, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.)

evidence of effectiveness Six studies have shown that Student Team Learning techniques increase intergroup friendships significantly more than control methods. The studies were conducted in integrated inner-city, rural, and suburban schools, and involved white, black, and Mexican-American students. Student Team Learning techniques have had positive effects on learning in the areas of mathematics, language arts, social studies, and reading, as well as on self-esteem, mutual concern, and liking for school.

implementation requirements Individual teachers can use Student Team Learning with the manual alone or with the available training filmstrip/tape. Participation in a six-hour workshop is recommended.

financial requirements Manual and materials for Student Team Learning with teacher-made materials, $3. Manuals with single copies of worksheets and quizzes for 20 one-week units, $8. Language arts 3-6 and 7-8, mathematics 3-8, nutrition 4-8 (4 units), $8; nutrition 9-12 (5 units), $8; language arts 3-6 (100 units), $20; supplementary manuals for reading, mathematics, language arts, social studies, mainstreaming, and class management and discipline, $1 each.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no cost. Visitors are welcome at project site and additional demonstration sites out of state by appointment. Project staff are available to attend out-of-state awareness meetings (costs to be negotiated). Training is provided at project site (adopter pays only its costs). Training is conducted at adopter site (costs to be negotiated). Certified trainers in 30 states can provide one-day, hands-on workshops sufficient for mastery of STL techniques for a standard fee of $100 plus expenses.

contact Robert E. Slavin; Center for Social Organization of Schools; 3505 N. Charles St.; Baltimore, MD 21218. (301) 338-7569.

Developmental Funding: National Institute of Education USOE JDRP No. 78-199a Approved: 2/15/79

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT STUDENT TEAMS-ACHIEVEMENT DIVISIONS (STAD): Language Arts

descriptors

Basic Skills, Elementary Secondary Education, Humanistic Education, Intergroup Relations, Language Arts, Peer Teaching, Self Concept, Social Integration, Teaching Methods, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by JDRP for students of all abilities, grades 4-9. STAD has also been used with students in grades 2-3 and 10-12, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description

An instructional technique placing students in four- or five-member heterogeneous learning teams to master basic language skills.

STAD is one of three Student Team Learning instructional processes. In STAD, students are assigned to four- or five-member teams. Each team is composed of a relatively high achieving student, a low achiever, and two or three average achievers. Teams are composed of both minority and non-minority students, boys and girls.

The teacher using STAD follows a regular pattern of activities, the first day teaching a lesson on the class objective. The next day, students go into teams to study the material the teacher has presented. The students use worksheets and answer sheets to help each other study the material and to assess their mastery of it. During this time, students typically quiz each other, explain problems, and mutually help each other become proficient in the skill. Finally, students take a 15-minute quiz on the material with no help from their teammates. Each student earns quiz points determined by comparing his/her score with scores of students on other teams who have about the same past academic performance. Individuals' points are compiled into team scores and team scores are recognized in a class newsletter at the end of the week.

Students using STAD in language arts typically learn more than students in traditional control classes, especially as measured by standardized tests. STAD students also gain more than control students in liking for school, self-esteem, positive relationships with students of different races, and other outcomes. STAD can be used with teacher-made materials or with inexpensive materials available from the project. It is easy to learn and use, and there are project trainers all over the United States able to help teachers learn to use STAD in the classroom.

(Student Teams-Achievement Divisions [STAD]: Language Arts, Student Team Learning: Intergroup Relations, and Teams-Games-Tournament [TGT], all described in this catalog, are affiliate projects of Student Team Learning, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.)

evidence of effectiveness

Six studies have shown that STAD students achieve two or three times more than would be expected, based on standardized test norms. Studies were conducted in urban, rural, and suburban schools with students in grades 4-6. Tests used were Hoyum-Sanders English Test and Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills Language Mechanics and Language Expression Subscales.

implementation requirements

Individual teachers can use STAD with the teacher's manual alone or with the manual plus the training filmstrip/tape. Available curriculum materials save teachers the task of making worksheets and quizzes. A two-hour workshop is recommended but not essential. Part of the Student Team Learning program, STAD can be implemented along with the other Student Team Learning methods or by itself.

financial requirements

Teacher's manual (all Student Team Learning techniques), $2. Manual set (manual, forms, and other Student Team Learning materials), $3. Awareness/training filmstrip/tape, $15 (refundable). Curriculum materials for language arts: grades 3-6 (20 one-week units), $8; grades 3-6 (100 one-week units), $20; grades 7-8 (20 one-week units), $8. Supplementary manual, $1. No special equipment or staff needed.

services available

No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

Awareness and training materials include brochure (free), teacher's manuals, filmstrip/tape, workshop leader's manual. Project trainers in 30 states are able to provide awareness or training workshops anywhere in the United States for a standard fee of $100 plus expenses. Potential adopters may visit demonstration sites in Maryland and elsewhere by appointment.

contact J. Richard Lewis; Area II Office; Frederick County Schools; 103 Prospect St.; Middletown, MD 21769. (301) 473-8910.

Developmental Funding: National Institute of Education USOE JDRP No. 79-12 Approved 4/17/79

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT TEAMS-GAMES-TOURNAMENT (TGT)

descriptors

Attitudes, Basic Skills, Class Organization, Cooperation, Educational Games, Elementary Secondary Education, Peer Teaching, Validated Programs

target audience

Approved by JDRP for pupils of all ability levels, grades 3-12.

description

An instructional method using cooperative teams and game tournaments to increase student learning of basic skills.

Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) is an instructional method that reorganizes the classroom by dividing pupils into four- or five-member groups for study and peer-tutoring on worksheets. Individual group members then play instructional games against members of equal ability from other groups to score points for their teams. The TGT instructional method is appropriate for any curriculum unit (grades 3-12) that offers basic skills or factual information to heterogeneous groups.

Teachers may use only the TGT Teacher's Manual, or may include the worksheets and games already developed by the Center that cover specific instructional objectives. TGT is designed to supplement traditional lecture or drill methods, individualized instruction, or performance-based instruction. The TGT instructional process is carefully sequenced to enhance academic achievement, but teachers may adapt and change elements to meet certain objectives.

TGT curriculum units are designed for six to eight weeks' use in each class period, although shorter units may be completed in three to four weeks. The units help to improve basic skills, promote positive pupil attitudes toward schoolwork and classroom experiences, and increase cooperation through peer-tutoring.

(Teams-Games-Tournament [TGT], Student Team Learning: Intergroup Relations, and Student Teams-Achievement Divisions [STAD]: Language Arts, all described in this catalog, are affiliate projects of Student Team Learning, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.)

evidence of effectiveness

Ten experimental studies have demonstrated positive TGT effects on academic achievement in math and language arts. Each study employed a control group and pre- and posttest measures of standardized achievement (Stanford Achievement Test in Mathematics; Hoyum-Sanders English Tests), plus treatment-specific tests. Four experimental studies have shown very positive TGT effects on classroom race-relations.

implementation requirements

Individual teachers can implement TGT through use of teacher's manual and construction of own worksheets and games. For school or district implementation, there should be general awareness training, followed by workshop training (one half-day). If TGT's published curriculum materials are used, no teacher development of materials is required.

financial requirements

Basic starter kit for use with teacher-made worksheets and games is available for $3. Objectives-based curriculum materials (worksheets and game sheets) available for reproduction: Language Arts, grades 3-8, 100 objectives, $20; 20 usage objectives, $8. Mathematics, grades 3-8: 20 basic objectives per grade level, $8 per grade level.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness and training materials (brochure, teacher's manual, research articles, and filmstrip) are available. Awareness and workshop training for adopters are available from project personnel and from certified trainers throughout the country.

contact John M. Hollifield; Center for Social Organization of Schools; 3505 N. Charles St.; Baltimore, MD 21218. (301) 366-3582.

Developmental Funding: National Institute of Education USOE JDRP No. 75-81 Approved: 12/18/75

PROJECT UPSTAIRS SCHOOL

descriptors Disadvantaged Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, Educational Alternatives, English, Humanistic Education, Individualized Instruction, Instructional Materials, Mathematics Instruction, Motivation Techniques, Reading Instruction, Remedial Reading Programs, Self Concept, Senior High Schools, Social Studies, Validated Programs

target audience Approved by JDRP as a reading program for students, grades 9-11, two or more years below grade level. It has been used in other settings with high school students two or more years below grade level in math and basic English skills, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description *A program intended to improve the reading ability of educationally disadvantaged students.*

The Upstairs School is designed to take the student from "where he is" to grade level. Incoming ninth-grade classes at Roosevelt High School have consistently been among the "bottom" two or three in the Portland School District in basic skills. More than one-third of the student body is two or more years below grade level. The objective of the Upstairs School has been to demonstrate growth in reading comprehension, vocabulary, and basic math skills. Improving student self-concept and self-confidence is another important goal. The philosophy of the program is that students would learn if they could and if teachers were willing to commit themselves to providing the necessary structure and love. An atmosphere of work, trust, concern, and loving care is unique to the program. All students are working. All are enrolled for one 50-minute period in the area of their needs. Students enter, leave, and return depending upon individual need. Classroom teaching is conducted as follows: Reading is taught in an open-space classroom divided into four teaching stations plus a central lounge area for individualized-interest reading. Reading students study phonics, letter formation, creative writing, dictation of phrases, vocabulary, and oral reading; they master lists of words from stories to be read; they learn to read for information through one-minute reading exercises followed by 10-question tests. Speed reading is offered for those preparing to leave the program. Math class emphasizes the basic skills of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, using timed drills and worksheets. Teaching aids include calculators, digitors, and "thinking" exercises. Topics covered include decimals, fractions, percents, averages, and algebra. The English basic skills lab covers such skills as listening, following directions, dictionary usage, writing, library and map skills, spelling, and grammar -- some of the 19 basic competencies that students must meet before enrollment in a regular English class. Individual records keep the student constantly aware of competencies met.

The Upstairs School is a highly structured "school within a school" and an alternative school in every sense.

(Inservice classes for the teaching staff are held for the entire nine month period.)

evidence of effectiveness Through the end of the 1977-78 school year, the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, given each spring to all program participants, demonstrated gains in reading, language arts, and mathematics exceeding goals set by program. Beginning in 1978-79, in a development following JDRP approval, the project used the Portland Achievement Test in pre- and posttesting and Rasch Units and NCE scores to evaluate evidenced gains.

implementation requirements Mastery teaching method is successfully used with a variety of reading materials, including linguistic materials, basic reading series, magazines, and newspapers. All textbooks are phonetics-oriented. Special-interest books are low-vocabulary. In addition, many teacher-developed materials are used. No special staffing or facilities are required. Training is required. A single teacher or an entire district may adopt.

financial requirements Funding averages $250 per student, with the district providing the usual support services.

services available No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

Awareness materials are available. Visitors are welcome by appointment. Training may be conducted at the project site (adopting site must cover all trainer costs as well as own costs). Training may be conducted out of state (exemplary project staff costs must be paid). Project staff can attend out-of-state conferences (expenses must be paid).

contact Joel W. Sappenfield, Project Director; 6941 N. Central; Portland, OR 97203. (503) 286-5781.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 30 Approved: 4/4-5/73

Compiled Summer 1979

PROJECT VRP: Reading Power in the Content Areas

descriptors

Content Reading, Inservice Teacher Education, Interdisciplinary Approach, Post Secondary Education, Readability, Reading Instruction, Reading Material Selection, Remedial Reading, Secondary Education, Staff Improvement, Validated Programs, Vocational Education

target audience

Approved by JDRP as a staff development project for vocational programs whose students represented a broad range of ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds, grades 11 and 12. VRP has been used at the postsecondary level and in junior and senior high nonvocational programs, but no evidence of effectiveness has been submitted to or approved by the Panel.

description

A staff-development project designed to help content area teachers minimize the gap between student reading abilities and reading requirements of printed instructional material.

The goals of this project are: to narrow the gap between student reading ability and the skill level required to read printed instructional materials; to help teachers make appropriate selections of printed materials and plan reading-related activities appropriate for the abilities of their students; to train every teacher as a reading teacher regardless of his/her discipline. The project has attempted to reach these goals through development of teacher-training materials and vocational student reading-support materials.

The program consists of five components. Testing trains teachers to use formal and informal tests and inventories to assess the reading abilities of their students. Readability Analysis provides teachers with the knowledge and tools to analyze the reading levels of printed instructional materials, to apply this knowledge in making text selection, and to modify and improve use of the printed materials to fit students' reading abilities. Fifteen Reading in the Content Area Modules provide materials for teaching reading in the content areas. Each module contains an activity manual, specific commercial texts, and articles related to the topic. The modules, which are designed to be used in group or individual inservice, provide basic strategies and procedures that can be incorporated into any classroom curriculum. Vocabulary Development focuses on practical vocabulary activities the teacher can incorporate into the total curriculum. In addition, for vocational adopters, project-developed vocational student reading-support materials in the form of 32 Occupationally Specific Key Word Glossaries are available. Instructional Materials System involves the development of a resource system which provides teachers with ready access to a wide variety of instructional materials in their field.

(VRP was originally developed at the Oakland Schools, Pontiac, Michigan, and visitors are still welcome at the site. In May, 1977, the Developer/Demonstrator function for the project was transferred to The EXCHANGE at the Minneapolis Public Schools/University of Minnesota Teacher Center.)

evidence of effectiveness

Using the Gates-MacGinitie, Survey F, pretest comprehension data indicated 70% of project students were reading below eleventh-grade level and 20% below seventh-grade level. Posttest data revealed percentages of 57% and 12% respectively. Pre- and post-test gains were significant at the .05 level. A pre/post teacher training test indicated significant growth in teacher knowledge of test utilization and reading-related activities.

implementation requirements

A minimum of one staff person with a background in curriculum development and/or reading to act as director/coordinator on a part-time basis. Involvement of administrators, content area instructors, and reading consultants, if any are used. Adopters must implement either the Readability or Testing component and either the Vocabulary or Content Area Modules component; implementation of all four is strongly encouraged. Once a district completes a training and implementation plan, the D/D can provide a training workshop. The training workshop takes two or three days, depending upon the needs of the adopting/adapting district.

financial requirements

Staff development time must be provided. No new equipment or staff are required. Key Word Glossaries are available at $3 each, $75 per set of 32. Adopters of this component may purchase glossaries for each student or one or two per classroom. Cost of individual Reading in the Content Area Modules varies: entire set of 15, under $300. Adopters of this component will typically purchase a minimum of five modules and a maximum of one complete set.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness brochures are available. A filmstrip/tape can be borrowed or purchased ($15). A limited number of awareness presentations and half- or full-day preadoption workshops for schools are available. Half of D/D travel costs must be reimbursed. After an implementation and training plan is developed, D/D can provide a training workshop. Two-thirds of D/D travel costs must be reimbursed; training manuals must be purchased ($6 each). Project provides follow-up assistance to adopters during the first year of implementation.

contact Eileen Ostergaard, or Carol Burgess; The EXCHANGE; 166 Peik Hall; University of Minnesota; Minneapolis, MN 55455. (612) 376-8234.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 74-45 Approved: 5/14-15/74

EXEMPLARY PROJECTS
BY STATE

ALABAMA

Improvement of Basic Reading Skills, Sylacauga p. 13

ARIZONA

Catch Up - Keep Up, Tucson p. 5

CALIFORNIA

project Catch-Up, Newport Beach p. 4
Learning to Read by Reading, Jamestown p. 16
the Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in Secondary Schools, Menlo Park p. 22
project R-3: Readiness, Relevancy and Reinforcement, San Jose p. 23
Right to Read: Wilson Junior High School, San Diego p. 28

COLORADO

STAMM: Systematic Teaching And Measuring Mathematics, Lakewood p. 30

CONNECTICUT

Higher Horizons 100, Hartford p. 10

GEORGIA

Reading/English Rotation Project, Thomson p. 24
Reading -- Individualized Remedial Laboratories/Math -- Individualized Remediation, Albany p. 27

ILLINOIS

Intensive Reading Improvement Program (IRIP), Chicago p. 15
Matteson Four-Dimensional Reading Program, Matteson p. 18
PEGASUS: Personalized Educational Growth and Achievement with Selective Utilization of Staff, Princeton p. 20
Pre-Algebra Development Centers, Chicago p. 21

LOUISIANA

Every Student Every Day, Morgan City p. 8

MARYLAND

Student Team Learning: Intergroup Relations, Baltimore p. 31
Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD): Language Arts, Middletown p. 32
Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT), Baltimore p. 33

MICHIGAN

HIT: High Intensity Tutoring, Highland Park p. 11

MINNESOTA

VRP: Reading Power in the Content Areas, Minneapolis p. 35

MISSOURI

Conceptually Oriented Mathematics Program (COMP), Columbia p. 7

NEW JERSEY

the New Jersey Writing Project, Monmouth Junction p. 19

NORTH CAROLINA

project Reading Improvement, Burgaw p. 25

OREGON

Upstairs School, Portland p. 34

RHODE ISLAND

Alternate Learning Project (ALP), Providence p. 3
SEAPORT: Student Education Assuring Positive Organized Reading Techniques, Newport p. 29

SOUTH CAROLINA

Math Laboratories for Disadvantaged Students, Honea Path p. 17

UTAH

Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI), Salt Lake City p. 9
Improving Achievement (Reading) Through Use of Teachers and Teacher Aides, Logan p. 14

VIRGINIA

Computer-Assisted-Diagnostic-Prescriptive Program in Reading and Mathematics (CADPP), Dillwyn p. 6

WASHINGTON

HOSTS: Help One Student To Succeed, Vancouver p. 12

WEST VIRGINIA

Reading Improvement Program -- Secondary Schools Reading Laboratory, Parkersburg p. 26

NDN DEVELOPER/DEMONSTRATOR PROJECTS

The following projects are funded as NDN Developer/Demonstrators to provide training, materials, and technical assistance to those who adopt their programs.

ARIZONA

Catch Up - Keep Up p. 5

CALIFORNIA

project Catch-Up p. 4
Learning to Read by Reading p. 16
project R-3: Readiness, Relevancy and Reinforcement p. 23

COLORADO

STAMM: Systematic Teaching And Measuring Mathematics p. 30

GEORGIA

Reading/English Rotation Project p. 24

ILLINOIS

Intensive Reading Improvement Program (IRIP) p. 15
Matteson Four-Dimensional Reading Program p. 17
Pre-Algebra Development Centers p. 21

LOUISIANA

Every Student Every Day p. 8

MARYLAND

Student Team Learning: Intergroup Relations p. 31
Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) p. 33

MICHIGAN

HIT: High Intensity Tutoring p. 11

MINNESOTA

VRP: Reading Power in the Content Areas p. 35

MISSOURI

Conceptually Oriented Mathematics Program (COMP) p. 7

NEW JERSEY

the New Jersey Writing Project p. 19

NORTH CAROLINA

project Reading Improvement p. 25

RHODE ISLAND

Alternate Learning Project (ALP) p. 3
SEAPORT: Student Education Assuring Positive Organized Reading Techniques p. 29

UTAH

Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI) p. 9

VIRGINIA

Computer-Assisted-Diagnostic-Prescriptive Program in Reading and Mathematics (CADPP) p. 6

WASHINGTON

HOSTS: Help One Student To Succeed p. 12

What Is the NDN?

The National Diffusion Network (NDN) is an expanding nationwide system with the goal of helping people in education solve pressing problems swiftly, efficiently, and economically through program improvement. The NDN links schools, postsecondary institutions, and others within and across state boundaries so that programs developed and proven effective in one locality can be used by others facing similar challenges.

Two groups of participants — Facilitators and Developer/Demonstrators — have received funding from the U.S. Office of Education to assist schools that are searching for ways to improve their programs. Facilitators are located in every state. They work to link the state's schools with suitable Developer/Demonstrators, who in turn provide training and other assistance for schools as they adopt or adapt these proven educational programs.